

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS
OJAI—CALIFORNIA
1949

(*Verbatim Report*)

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS

OJAI—CALIFORNIA

1949

(*Verbatim Report*)

Copyright 1950 by Krishnamurti Writings Inc

Published by
KRISHNAMURTI WRITINGS INC
OJAI, CALIFORNIA
MADRAS, INDIA
LONDON, ENGLAND

Translation and all rights reserved
printed in India at the G. S. Press, Madras

I

I think it is very important that we should be most earnest. Those who come to these gatherings, those who go to various meetings of this kind, think they are very earnest and serious. But I would like to find out what we mean by being earnest, by being serious. Is it earnestness, does it show seriousness, if we go from one lecturer or talker to another, from one leader to another, from one teacher to another; if we go to different groups, or pass through different organizations, in search of something? So, before we begin to find out what it is to be earnest, surely we must find out what it is that we are seeking.

What is it that most of us are seeking? What is it that each one of us wants? Especially in this restless world, where everybody is trying to find some kind of peace, some kind of happiness, a refuge, surely it is important to find out, isn't it?, what it is that we are trying to seek, what it is that we are trying to discover. Probably most of us are seeking some kind of happiness, some kind of peace; in a world that is ridden with turmoil, wars, contention, strife, we want a refuge, where there can be some peace. I think that is what most of us want. And so we pursue, go from one leader to another, from one religious organization to another, from one teacher to another.

Now, is it that we are seeking happiness, or is it that we are seeking gratification of some kind, from which we hope to derive happiness? Surely, there is a difference between happiness and gratification. Can you seek happiness? Perhaps you can find gratification; but, surely, you cannot find happiness. Happiness is derivative, surely; it is a by-product of something else. So, before we give our minds and hearts to something which demands a great deal of earnestness, attention, thought, care, we must find out, must we not?,

what it is that we are seeking; whether it is happiness, or gratification. I am afraid most of us are seeking gratification. We want to be gratified, we want to find a sense of fullness at the end of our search.

Now, can you seek anything? Why do you come to these meetings? Why are you all sitting here and listening to me? It would be very interesting to find out why you are listening, why you take the trouble to come from long distances on a hot day, and listen. And, to what are you listening? Are you trying to find a solution for your troubles, and is that why you go from one lecturer to another, and through various religious organizations, and read books, and so on and on; or, are you trying to find out the cause of all the trouble, the misery, contention and strife? Surely, that does not demand that you should read a great deal, that you should attend innumerable meetings, or search out teachers? What it demands is clarity of intention, isn't it?

After all, if one is seeking peace, one can find it very easily. One can devote oneself blindly to some kind of a cause, to an idea, and take shelter there. Surely, that does not solve the problem. Mere isolation in an enclosing idea is not a release from conflict. So, we must find, must we not?, what it is, inwardly, as well as outwardly, that each one of us wants. If we are clear on that matter, then we don't have to go anywhere, to any teacher, to any church, to any organization. So, our difficulty is, is it not?, to be clear in ourselves regarding our intention. Can we be clear? And does that clarity come through searching, through trying to find out what others say, from the highest teacher to the ordinary preacher in a church round the corner? Have you got to go to somebody to find out? And yet, that is what we are doing, is it not? We read innumerable books, we attend many meetings and discuss, we join various organizations—trying thereby to find a remedy

to the conflict, to the miseries in our lives. Or, if we don't do all that, we think we have found ; that is, we say that a particular organization, a particular teacher, a particular book satisfies us ; we have found everything we want in that ; and we remain in that, crystallized and enclosed.

So, we have to come to the point when we ask ourselves, really earnestly and profoundly, if peace, happiness, reality, God, or what you will, can be given to us by someone else. Can this incessant search, this longing, give us that extraordinary sense of reality, that creative being, which comes when we really understand ourselves ? Does self-knowledge come through search, through following someone else, through belonging to any particular organization, through reading books, and so on ? After all, that is the main issue, is it not ?, that as long as I do not understand myself, I have no basis for thought, and all my search will be in vain. I can escape into illusions, I can run away from contention, strife, struggle ; I can worship another ; I can look for my salvation through somebody else. But as long as I am ignorant of myself, as long as I am unaware of the total process of myself, I have no basis for thought, for affection, for action.

But that is the last thing we want : to know ourselves. Surely, that is the only foundation on which we can build. But, before we can build, before we can transform, before we can condemn or destroy, we must know that which we are. So, to go out seeking, changing teachers, gurus, practising yoga, breathing, performing rituals, following Masters, and all the rest of it, is utterly useless, is it not ? It has no meaning, even though the very people whom we follow may say : Study yourself. Because, what we are, the world is. If we are petty, jealous, vain, greedy—that is what we create about us, that is the society in which we live.

So, it seems to me, that before we set out on a journey to find reality, to find God, before we can act, before we can have any relationship with another, which is society, surely it is essential that we begin to understand ourselves first. And I consider the earnest person to be one who is completely concerned with this, first, and not with how to arrive at a particular goal. Because, if you and I do not understand ourselves, how can we, in action, bring about a transformation in society, in relationship, in anything that we do ? And it does not mean, obviously, that self-knowledge is opposed to, or isolated from, relationship. It does not mean, obviously, emphasis on the individual, the me, as opposed to the mass, as opposed to another. I do not know if some of you have seriously undertaken to study yourselves, watching every word, and its responses; watching every movement of thought and feeling—just watching it, being conscious of your bodily responses, whether you act from your physical centers, or whether you act from an idea ; how you respond to the world condition. I do not know if you have ever seriously gone into this question at all. Perhaps sporadically, as a last resort, when everything else has failed and you are bored, some of you have tried it.

Now, without knowing yourself, without knowing your own way of thinking, and why you think certain things, without knowing the background of your conditioning, and why you have certain beliefs about art and religion, about your country and your neighbor, and about yourself, how can you think truly about anything ? Without knowing your background, without knowing the substance of your thought and whence it comes—surely, your search is utterly futile, your action has no meaning, has it ? Whether you are an American, or a Hindu, or what your religion is, has no meaning either.

So, before we can find out what the

end-purpose of life is, what it all means—wars, national antagonisms, conflicts, the whole mess—surely, we must begin with ourselves, must we not? It sounds so simple, but it is extremely difficult. Because, to follow oneself, to see how one's thought operates, one has to be extraordinarily alert; so that, as one begins to be more and more alert to the intricacies of one's own thinking and responses and feelings, one begins to have a greater awareness, not only of oneself, but of another with whom one is in relationship. To know oneself, is to study oneself in action, which is relationship. But, the difficulty is that we are so impatient; we want to get on, we want to reach an end. And so we have neither the time nor the occasion, to give ourselves the opportunity, to study, to observe. Or, we have committed ourselves to various activities—to earning a livelihood, to rearing children—or have taken on certain responsibilities of various organizations; we have so committed ourselves in different ways, that we have hardly any time for self-reflection, to observe, to study. So, really, the responsibility of the reaction depends on oneself, not on another. And the pursuit, as in America and all the world over, of gurus and their systems, reading the latest books on this and that, and so on, seems to me so utterly empty, so utterly futile; for you may wander all over the earth, but you have to come back to yourself. And, as most of us are totally unaware of ourselves, it is extremely difficult to begin to see clearly the process of our thinking and feeling and acting. And that is the thing I am going to deal with during the weeks that are to follow in which I am to talk.

The more you know yourself, the more clarity there is. Self-knowledge has no end—you don't come to an achievement, you don't come to a conclusion. It is an endless river. And as one studies it, as one goes into it more and more, one finds peace. Only when the mind is

tranquil—through self-knowledge and not through imposed self-discipline—only then, in that tranquillity, in that silence, can reality come into being. It is only then that there can be bliss, that there can be creative action. And it seems to me that without this understanding, without this experience, merely to read books, to attend talks, to do propaganda, is so infantile—just an activity without much meaning. Whereas, if one is able to understand oneself, and thereby bring about that creative happiness, that experiencing of something that is not of the mind, then perhaps there can be a transformation in the immediate relationship about us, and so in the world in which we live.

Question: Do I have to be at any special level of consciousness to understand you?

KRISHNAMURTI: To understand anything—not only what I am saying, but to understand anything—what is required? To understand yourself, to understand your husband, your wife, to understand a picture, to understand the scenery, the trees, what is required? Right attention, isn't it? Because, to understand something, you must give your whole being to it, your undivided, full, deep attention, must you not? And how can there be deep, full attention, when you are distracted?—for example, when you are taking down notes as I am talking, you catch a good phrase, probably, and you say, "By Jove, I am going to take that down, I am going to use it in my talk." How can there be full attention when you are merely concerned with words? That is, you are concentrated on the verbal level, and so are incapable of going beyond that verbal level. Words are only a means of communication. But, if you are not capable of communicating, and merely stick to words, obviously there cannot be full attention; therefore, there is no right understanding.

So, listening is an art, is it not? To understand something, you must give full attention, and that is not possible when there is any kind of distraction: taking notes, or when you are sitting uncomfortably, or when you are struggling to understand by making an effort. Making an effort to understand is obviously a hindrance to understanding, because your whole attention has gone into making the effort. I do not know if you have ever noticed that when you are interested in something that another is saying, you are not making an effort, you are not building up a wall of resistance against distraction. There are no distractions when you are interested; you are giving your full attention eagerly, spontaneously, to something that is being said. When there is vital interest, there is spontaneous attention. But most of us find such attention very difficult; because, consciously, on the upper level of the mind, you may want to understand, but inwardly there is resistance; or, inwardly there may be a desire to understand, but outwardly, superficially, there is resistance.

So, to give full attention to something, there must be integration of your whole being. Because, at one level of consciousness you may want to find out, you may want to know; but at another level, that very knowing may mean destruction, because it may make you change your whole life. So, there is an inward contention, an inward struggle, of which you are perhaps unaware. Though you think you are paying attention, there is really a distraction going on inwardly or outwardly; and that is the difficulty.

So, to understand anything, one must give complete attention; and that is why I have been suggesting at various meetings that no notes should be taken, that you are not here to do propaganda, for me or for yourself; that you should listen only in order to understand. Our difficulty in understanding, is that our mind is

never quiet. We never look at anything quietly, in a receptive mood. A lot of rubbish is thrown at us by newspapers, magazines, politicians, tub-thumpers; every preacher around the corner tells us what to do and what not to do. All that is constantly pouring in; and, naturally, there is also an inward resistance to it all. There can be no understanding as long as the mind is disturbed. As long as the mind is not very quiet, silent, tranquil, receptive, sensitive, it is not possible to understand, and this sensitivity of the mind is not merely at the upper level of consciousness, in the superficial mind. There must be tranquillity right through, an integrated tranquillity. When you are in the presence of something very beautiful, if you begin to chatter you will not sense its meaning. But the moment you are quiet, the moment you are sensitive, its beauty comes to you. Similarly, if we would understand anything, not only must we be physically still, but our minds must be extremely alert, yet tranquil. That alert passivity of the mind does not come about through compulsion. You cannot train the mind to be silent; then it is merely like a trained monkey, outwardly quiet, but inwardly boiling. So, listening is an art; and you must give your time, your thought, your whole being, to that which you want to understand.

Question: Can I understand easier what you are saying by teaching it to others?

KRISHNAMURTI: You may learn, by telling it to others, a new way of putting things, a clever way of transmitting what you want to say; but, surely, that is not understanding. If you don't understand yourself, how in the name of names can you tell it to somebody else? Surely, that is merely propaganda, isn't it? You don't understand something, but you tell others about it; and you think a truth can be repeated. Do you think,

if you have an experience, you can tell it to others? You may be able to communicate verbally; but can you tell others of your experience—that is, can you convey the experiencing of a thing? You may describe the experience, but you cannot convey the state of experiencing. So, a truth that is repeated, ceases to be a truth. It is only the lie that can be repeated; but the moment you 'repeat' a truth, it loses its meaning. And most of us are concerned with repeating, but are not experiencing. A man who is experiencing something is not concerned with mere repetition, with trying to convert others, with propaganda. But unfortunately, most of us are concerned with propaganda; because, through propaganda, we try not only to convince others, but also gain a living by exploiting others; it gradually becomes a racket.

So, if you are not caught up in mere verbalization, but are really occupied with experiencing, then you and I are in communion. But, if you want to do propaganda—and I say truth cannot be propagandized—then there is no relationship between us. And I am afraid that is our difficulty at the present time. You want to tell others, without experiencing; and in telling, you hope to experience. That is mere sensation, mere gratification; it has no significance. It has no validity, no reality behind it. But, a reality experienced, if communicated, creates no bondage. So, experiencing is much more important, has greater significance, than communication on the verbal level.

Question: It seems to me that the movement of life is experienced in relationship with people and ideas. To detach oneself from such stimulation is to live in a depressing vacuum. I need distractions to feel alive.

KRISHNAMURTI: In this question is involved the whole problem of detachment and relationship. Now,

why do we want to be detached? What is this instinct in most of us that wants to push away, that wants to be detached? It may be, that for most of us this idea of detachment has come into being because so many religious teachers have talked about it: "You must be detached in order to find reality; you must renounce, you must give up, and then only will you find reality." And can we be detached in relationship? What do we mean by relationship? So, we will have to go into this question a little carefully.

Now, why have we this instinctive response, this constant looking to detachment? The various religious teachers have said, you must be detached. Why? First of all, the problem is, why are we attached? Not how to be detached, but why is it that you are attached? Surely, if you can find the answer to that, then there is no question of detachment, is there? Why are we attached to attractions, to sensations, to things of the mind or of the heart? If we can discover why we are attached, then perhaps we will find the right answer—not how to be detached.

Why are you attached? And what would happen if you were not attached? If you were not attached to your particular name, property, position—you know, the whole mass of things that makes up you: your furniture, your car, your characteristics, your idiosyncrasies, your virtues, your beliefs, your ideas—what would happen? If you were not attached, you would find yourself to be as nothing, would you not? If you were not attached to your comforts, to your position, to your vanity, you would be suddenly lost, would you not? So, the fear of emptiness, the fear of being nothing, makes you attached to something—whether it is to your family, to your husband, wife, to a chair, to a car, to your country—it doesn't matter what. The fear of being nothing makes one cling to something; and in the process of holding on, there is conflict,

there is pain. Because, what you hold onto soon disintegrates, dies ; your car, your position, your property, your husband. So, in the process of holding, there is pain ; and in order to avoid pain, we say we must be detached. You look into yourself and you will see that this is so. Fear of loneliness, fear of being nothing, fear of emptiness, makes us attach ourselves to something : to a country, to an idea, to a God, to some organization, to a Master, to a discipline, what you will. In the process of attachment, there is pain ; and to avoid that pain, we try to cultivate detachment, and so we keep up this circle which is always painful, in which there is always a struggle.

Now, why can't we be as nothing, a non-entity ? Not merely on the verbal level, but inwardly ? Then there is no problem of attachment or detachment, is there ? And, in that state, can there be relationship ? Because, that is what this questioner wants to know. He says that without relationship to people and to ideas, one lives in a depressing vacuum. Is that so ? Is relationship a process of attachment ? When you are attached to somebody, are you related to that person ? When I am attached to you, hold on to you, possess you, am I related to you ? You become a necessity to me because, without you, I am lost, I am made uncomfortable, I feel miserable, I feel lonely. So, you become a necessity, a useful thing, a thing to fill my emptiness. You are not important ; what is important is that you fill my need. And is there any relationship between us, when to me you are a need, a necessity, like a piece of furniture ?

To put it differently, can one live without relationship ? And is relationship merely a stimulation ? Because, without that, which you call distraction, you feel lost, you do not feel alive. That is, you treat relationship as a distraction, which makes you feel alive. That is what the questioner says.

Can one live in the world without relationship ? Obviously not. There is nothing that can live in isolation. Some of us, perhaps, would like to live in isolation ; but one cannot do it. Therefore, relationship becomes merely a distraction, which makes you feel as though you were alive : quarrelling with each other, having struggles, contention, and so on, gives one a sense of aliveness. So, relationship becomes merely a distraction. And, as the questioner says, without distractions, you feel you are dead. Therefore, you use relationship merely as a means of distraction ; and distraction, whether drink, going to cinemas, accumulating knowledge—any form of distraction—, obviously dulls the mind and heart, does it not ? A dull mind, a dull heart—how can it have any relationship with another ? It is only a sensitive mind, a heart that is awakened to affection, that can be related to something.

So, as long as you treat relationship as a distraction, you are obviously living in a vacuum, because you are frightened to go out of that state of distraction. Hence you are afraid of any kind of detachment, any kind of separation. Relationship then is a distraction which makes you feel alive. Whereas, true relationship, which is not a distraction, is really a state in which you are constantly in a process of understanding yourself in relation to something. That is, relationship is a process of self-revelation, not of distraction ; and that self-revelation is very painful, because in relationship you soon find yourself out, if you are open to discover it. But as most of us do not want to discover ourselves, as most of us would rather hide ourselves in relationship, relationship becomes blindly painful, and we try to detach ourselves from it. Relationship is not a stimulation. Why do you want to be stimulated through relationship ? And if you are, then relationship, like stimulation, becomes dull. I do not know if you have noticed that any kind of stimulation eventually

dulls the mind and the sensitivity of the heart.

So, the question of detachment should never arise; because only the man who possesses, thinks of renouncing; but he never questions *why* he possesses, what is the background that has made him possessive. When he understands the process of possessing, then there is naturally freedom from possession—not the cultivation of an opposite, as detachment. And relationship is merely a stimulation, a distraction, as long as we are using another as a means of self-gratification, or as a necessity, in order to escape from ourselves. You become very important to me, because in myself I am very poor; in myself I am nothing, therefore you are everything. Such a relationship is bound to be a conflict, a pain; and a thing that gives pain is no longer a distraction. Therefore, we want to escape from that relationship, which we call detachment.

So, as long as we use the mind in relationship, there can be no understanding of relationship. Because, after all, it is the mind that makes us be detached. When there is love, there is no question of attachment or detachment. The moment there is the cessation of that love, then the question of attachment and detachment begins. Love is not the product of thought: you cannot think about love. It is a state of being. And when the mind interferes, by its calculation, by its jealousies, by its various cunning deceptions, then the problem in relationship arises. Relationship has significance only when it is a process of revealing oneself to oneself; and if, in that process, one proceeds deeply, widely and extensively, then in relationship there is peace—not the contention, not the antagonism between two people. Only in that quietness, in that relationship in which there is the fruition of self-knowledge, is there peace.

II

As I was suggesting yesterday, we should be able to listen to what is being said without rejection, or acceptance. We should be able to listen so that, if something new is being said, we do not immediately reject it—which does not mean either, that we must accept everything that is being said. That would be really absurd; because then we would merely be building up authority, and where there is authority, there can be no thinking, feeling; there can be no discovery of the new. And, as most of us are inclined to accept something eagerly, without true understanding, there is a danger, is there not?, that we may accept without thought or investigation, without looking deeply into it. This morning I may perhaps say something new, or put something differently, which you may pass by, if you do not listen with that ease, with that quietness which brings understanding.

I want to discuss this morning a subject which may be rather difficult: the question of action, activity and relationship. Then I will answer questions. But before I do that, we have to understand first what we mean by activity, what we mean by action. Because, our whole life seems based on action, or rather, activity—I want to differentiate between activity and action. We seem to be so engrossed in doing things; we are so restless, so consumed with movement, doing something at any cost, getting on, achieving, trying for success. And what is the place of activity in relationship? Because, as we were discussing yesterday, life is a question of relationship. Nothing can exist in isolation; and if relationship is merely an activity, then relationship has not much significance. I do not know if you have noticed that the moment you cease to be active, there is immediately a feeling of nervous apprehension; you feel as though you are not alive, not alert.

so you must keep going. And there is the fear of being alone—of going out for a walk alone, of being by yourself, without a book, without a radio, without talking; the fear of sitting quietly without doing something all the time with your hands or with your mind or with your heart.

So, to understand activity, surely we must understand relationship, must we not? If we treat relationship as a distraction, as an escape from something else, relationship then is merely an activity. And is not most of our relationship merely a distraction, and therefore but a series of activities involved in relationship? As I said, relationship has true significance only when it is a process of self-revelation, when it is the revealing to oneself in the very action of relationship. But most of us do not want to be revealed in relationship. On the contrary, we use relationship as a means of covering up our own insufficiency, our own troubles, our own uncertainty. So, relationship becomes mere movement, mere activity. I do not know if you have noticed that relationship is very painful; and that as long as it is not a revealing process, in which you are discovering yourself, relationship is merely a means of escape from yourself.

I think it is important to understand this; because, as we were discussing yesterday, the question of self-knowledge lies in the unfolding of relationship, whether to things, to people, or to ideas. Can relationship be based on an idea? And, surely, any act based on an idea must be merely the continuation of that idea, which is activity. Action is not based on an idea. Action is immediate, spontaneous, direct, without the process of thought involved. But when we base action on an idea, then it becomes an activity; and if we base our relationship on an idea, then surely such a relationship is merely an activity, without comprehension. It is merely carrying out a formula,

a pattern, an idea. Because we want something out of relationship, such relationship is always restricting, limiting, confining.

Idea is, is it not?, the outcome of a want, of a desire, of a purpose. If I am related to you because I need you, physiologically or psychologically, then that relationship is obviously based on idea, is it not?; because I want something from you. And such a relationship, based on an idea, cannot be a self-revealing process. It is merely a momentum, an activity, a monotony, in which habit is established. Hence, such relationship is always a strain, a pain, a contention, a struggle, causing us agony.

Is it possible to be related without idea, without demand, without ownership, possession? Can we commune with each other—which is real relationship on all the different levels of consciousness—if we are related to each other through a desire, a physical or psychological need? And can there be relationship without these conditioning causes, arising from want? As I said, this is quite a difficult problem. One has to go very deeply and very quietly into it. It is not a question of accepting or rejecting.

We know what our relationship is at present—a contention, a struggle, a pain; or, mere habit. If we can understand fully, completely, relationship with the one, then perhaps there is a possibility of understanding relationship with the many, that is, with society. If I do not understand my relationship with the one, I certainly shall not understand my relationship with the whole, with society, with the many. And if my relationship with the one is based on a need, on gratification, then my relationship with society must be the same. Therefore, there must follow contention, with the one and with the many. And is it possible to live, with the one and with the many, without demand? Surely, that is the problem, is it not? Not only between you and me, but between me and society.

And to understand that problem, to inquire into it very deeply, you have to go into the question of self-knowledge ; because, without knowing yourself as you are, without knowing exactly what is, obviously, you cannot have right relationship with another. Do what you will—escape, worship, read, go to cinemas, turn on radios—as long as there is no understanding of yourself, you cannot have right relationship. Hence the contention, battle, antagonism, confusion not only in you, but outside of you and about you. As long as we use relationship, merely as a means of gratification, of escape, as a distraction which is mere activity, there can be no self-knowledge. But self-knowledge is understood, is uncovered, its process is revealed, through relationship—that is, if you are willing to go into the question of relationship and expose yourself to it. Because, after all, you cannot live without relationship. But we want to use that relationship to be comfortable, to be gratified, to be something. That is, we use relationship based on an idea ; which means, the mind plays the important part in relationship. And as mind is concerned always with protecting itself, with remaining always within the known, it reduces all relationship to the level of habit, or of security ; and therefore, relationship becomes merely an activity.

So, you see that relationship, if we allow it, can be a process of self-revelation ; but, since we do not allow it, relationship becomes merely a gratifying activity. As long as the mind merely uses relationship for its own security, that relationship is bound to create confusion and antagonism. And is it possible to live in relationship without the idea of demand, of want, of gratification ? Which means, is it possible to love without the interference of the mind ? We love with the mind, our hearts are filled with the things of the mind ; but surely, the fabrications of the mind cannot be love. You cannot

think about love. You can think about the person whom you love ; but that thought is not love, and so, gradually, thought takes the place of love. And, when the mind becomes supreme, the all-important, then obviously, there can be no affection. Surely, that is our problem, is it not ? We have filled our hearts with the things of the mind. And the things of the mind are essentially ideas—what should be, and what should not be. Can relationship be based on an idea ? And if it is, is it not a self-enclosing activity and therefore inevitable that there should be contention, strife, and misery ? But if the mind does not interfere, then it is not creating a barrier, it is not disciplining, suppressing or sublimating itself. This is extremely difficult, because it is not through determination, practice, or discipline, that the mind can cease to interfere ; the mind will cease to interfere only when there is full comprehension of its own process. Then only is it possible to have right relationship with the one and with the many, free of contention and discord.

Question : I gather definitely from you that learning and knowledge are impediments. To what are they impediments ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Obviously, knowledge and learning are an impediment to the understanding of the new, the timeless, the eternal. Surely, developing a perfect technique does not make you creative. You may know how to paint marvellously, you may have the technique ; but you may not be a creative painter. You may know how to write poems, technically most perfect ; but you may not be a poet. To be a poet implies, does it not ?, being capable of receiving the new ; to be sensitive enough to respond to something new, fresh. But, with most of us, knowledge, or learning has become an addiction, and we think that through knowing we

shall be creative. A mind that is crowded, encased in facts, in knowledge—is it capable of receiving something new, sudden, spontaneous? If your mind is crowded with the known, is there any space in it to receive something that is of the unknown? Surely, knowledge is always of the known; and with the known, we are trying to understand the unknown, something which is beyond measure.

Take, for example, a very ordinary thing that happens to most of us: those who are religious—whatever that word may mean for the moment—try to imagine what God is, or try to think about what God is. They have read innumerable books, they have read about the experiences of the various saints, the Masters, the Mahatmas, and all the rest, and they try to imagine, or try to feel, what the experience of another is. That is, with the known, you try to approach the unknown. Can you do it? Can you think of something that is not knowable? You can only think of something that you know. But there is this extraordinary perversion taking place in the world at the present time: we think we shall understand if we have more information, more books, more facts, more printed matter.

Surely, to be aware of something that is not the projection of the known, there must be the elimination through the understanding of the process of the known. Why is it that the mind clings always to the known? Is it not because the mind is constantly seeking certainty, security? Its very nature is fixed in the known, in time; and how can such a mind, whose very foundation is based on the past, on time, experience the timeless? It may conceive, formulate, picture the unknown, but that is all absurd. The unknown can come into being only when the known is understood, dissolved, put aside. And that is extremely difficult; because the moment you have an experience of anything, the mind translates it into

the terms of the known and reduces it to the past. I do not know if you have noticed that every experience is immediately translated into the known, given a name, tabulated, and recorded. So, the movement of the known, is knowledge. And, obviously, such knowledge, learning, is a hindrance.

Suppose you had never read a book, religious or psychological, and you had to find the meaning, the significance, of life. How would you set about it? Suppose there were no Masters, no religious organizations, no Buddha, no Christ, and you had to begin from the beginning. How would you set about it? First, you would have to understand your process of thinking, would you not?—and not project yourself, your thoughts, into the future and create a God which pleases you; that would be too childish. So, first you would have to understand the process of your thinking. Surely, that is the only way to discover anything new, is it not?

When we say that learning or knowledge is an impediment, is a hindrance, surely we are not including technical knowledge—how to drive a car, how to run machinery, or the efficiency which such knowledge brings. We have in mind quite a different thing: that sense of creative happiness which no amount of knowledge or learning will bring. And, to be creative in the truest sense of that word, is to be free of the past from moment to moment. Because, it is the past that is continually shadowing the present. Merely to cling to information, to the experiences of others, to what someone has said, however great, and try to approximate your action to that—all that is knowledge, is it not? But, to discover anything new, you must start on your own; you must start on a journey completely denuded, especially of knowledge. Because it is very easy, through knowledge and belief, to have experiences; but those experiences are merely the products of

self-projection, and therefore utterly unreal, false. And if you are to discover for yourself what is the new, it is no good carrying the burden of the old, especially knowledge—the knowledge of another, however great. Now, you use knowledge as a means of self-protection, security, and you want to be quite sure that you have the same experiences as the Buddha, or the Christ, or X. But a man who is protecting himself constantly through knowledge, is obviously not a truth-seeker.

For the discovery of truth, there is no path. You must enter the uncharted sea—which is not depressing, which is not being adventurous. Surely, when you want to find something new, when you are experimenting with anything, your mind has to be very quiet, has it not? But if your mind is crowded, filled with facts, knowledge, they act as an impediment to the new; and our difficulty is, for most of us, the mind has become so important, so predominantly significant, that it interferes constantly with anything that may be new, with anything that may exist simultaneously with the known. So, knowledge and learning are impediments for those who would seek, for those who would try to understand that which is timeless.

Question: I gather from your various talks that thought must cease before there can be understanding. What is that thinking which must come to an end? What do you mean by thinking and thought?

KRISHNAMURTI: I hope you are interested in all this. After all, you should be; because that is what you are doing. The only instrument we have is the mind, thought; and what do we mean by thinking? What do we mean by thought? How does it arise? What is its function? So, let us investigate it together. Though I may answer it, you too, please, think it out; let us think it out together.

What is thought? Surely, thought is the result of the past, isn't it? Thought is founded upon the reaction of the past, of yesterday, and of many, many, many yesterdays. You would not be capable of thinking if there were no yesterdays. So, thought is the result of the conditioned responses, established in the mind as the past. The mind is the result of the past. That is, thinking is the response of memory. If you had no memory, there would be no thinking. If you had no memory of the way to your house, you could not get there. So, thinking is the response of memory. Memory is a process, a residue of experiences—whether immediate, or of the past. Contact, sensation, desire, create experience. That is, through contact, sensation, desire, there is experience; that experience leaves a residue, which we call memory, whether pleasant or unpleasant, profitable or unprofitable. From that residue there is a response, which we call thinking, conditioned according to different environmental influences, and so on and so on. That is, the mind—not only the upper levels of consciousness, but the whole process—is the residue of the past. After all, you and I are the result of the past. Our whole conscious process of living, thinking, feeling, is based on the past; and, most of us live in the upper levels of consciousness, the superficial mind. There we are active, there we have our problems, innumerable contentions, every-day questions; and with that we are satisfied. But surely, what is on the surface, the little that shows, is not the whole content of consciousness. To understand the whole content of consciousness, the superficial mind must be quiet, if only for a few seconds, a few minutes. Then it is possible, is it not?, to receive what is the unknown.

Now, if thought is merely the response of the past, then the thought process must cease for something new, must it not? If thought is the result of time, which it is, then, to

have the intimation of the timeless, of something which you do not know, the thought process must come to an end, must it not? To receive something new, the old must cease. If you have a modern picture, and if you don't understand it, you cannot approach it with your classical training; at least for the time being, you must put it aside to understand the new. Similarly, if you are to understand that which is new, timeless, then the mind, which is the instrument of thought, which is the residue of the past, must come to an end; and the process of ending thought—though that may sound rather crazy—does not come through discipline, through so-called meditation. We will discuss presently, in the following weeks, what is right meditation, and so on. But we can see that any action on the part of the mind to make itself come to an end, is still a process of thought.

So, this problem is really quite arduous to go into and quite subtle. Because, there can be no happiness, there can be no joy, no bliss, unless there is creative renewal; and this creative renewal cannot take place if the mind is constantly projecting itself into the future, into the tomorrow, into the next second. And, as it does that all the time, we are uncreative. We may produce babies; but to be inwardly creative, to have that extraordinary sense of renewal in which there is constant newness, freshness, in which the mind is totally absent—that sense of creativeness cannot take place if the mind is constantly projecting itself into the future, into the tomorrow. That is why it is important to understand the whole thought process. Without understanding the thought process—all its subtleties, its varieties, its depth—you cannot come to the other. You may talk about it, but you have to stop thinking—though it sounds crazy. To have that renewal, that freshness, that extraordinary sense of otherness, the mind must understand itself. And that is why it is im-

portant that there should be deeper and wider awareness of self-knowledge.

Question: I agree with you that knowledge has not brought happiness. I have been trying to be receptive, to be intuitive and eager for hints from within. Am I on the right track?

KRISHNAMURTI: To understand this question, we must understand what we mean by consciousness; because, what you call intuition may be the projection of your own desire. There are so many people who say, "I believe in reincarnation. I feel it is so. My intuition tells me." It is obviously their desire to prolong, to continue themselves. Because they are so scared of death, they want to be assured that there is a next life, another opportunity, and so on, and so on. Therefore, 'intuitively' they feel it is correct. So, to understand this question, we must understand what you mean by within and without. Is it possible to receive intimations of that which is within when you are continually seeking an end—when you want to attain, when you want to cultivate, when you want to be happy? Surely, to receive intimations from within, the mind, the upper mind, must be completely free from all entanglements and prejudices, from all want, from all nationalism; otherwise, your 'intimations' will make you into the greatest nationalist, and a terror to the rest of the world.

So, our question is, how is it possible to receive the intimation of the unknown without warping it, without translating it into our conditioned thought-pattern? To understand that, we must go into the question of what is consciousness. What do we mean by being conscious? What is the process of consciousness? When do you say you are conscious? Surely, you say, "I am conscious," when you are experiencing, do you

not? When there is an experience—whether pleasurable or not pleasurable is irrelevant—then, there is an awareness of your being conscious of that experience. Then, from that experiencing, the next step is, you name it, you term it, do you not? You say it is pleasure, it is not pleasure; this I remember, that I do not remember. So you give it a name. Then you record it, do you not? By the very process of giving it a name, you are recording it. Are you following all this, or is it too Sunday-morningish? (Laughter).

So, there is consciousness only when there is experiencing, terming, and recording. Don't accept what I am saying—watch it yourself, and you will see this is how it operates. This is going on at all the levels, all the time, consciously or unconsciously. And, at the deeper levels of consciousness, the process is almost instantaneous, as on the upper level; but the difference is, is it not?, that on the upper level there is choice, there is choosing; at the wider, deeper level, there is instant recognition, without choice. And the upper mind or the superficial mind can receive the intimation only when this terming or naming or recording process comes to an end—which happens when the problem is much too great, or much too difficult. You try to solve a problem, and there is no answer. Then you let it go. The moment you let it go, there is a response, there is an intimation; because the mind, the conscious mind, is no longer struggling, trying to find an answer. It is quiet. The very exhaustion is a process of quietness; and therefore, the mind is capable of receiving the intimation. But the so-called intuition that the majority of people have, is really their own wish-fulfillment. That is why there are so many wars, organized beliefs, antagonisms, so much contention, because each one thinks his intuition is so true, that for it be is willing to die, or ill-treat others.

I am afraid the person who thinks

he is following intuition is obviously on the wrong track; because, to understand all this, one must transcend reason. To transcend reason, you must first know what the reasoning process is. You cannot go beyond something which you do not know; to go beyond it, you must know what it is; you must understand the whole meaning of reason, how to reason, how to go into it—you cannot jump beyond it. That does not mean that you must have a very clever brain, that you must be a great student, someone erudite. It needs honesty of thinking, clarity, the desire to be open, to invite what is, without fear of suffering. Then the barrier between the inner and the outer is non-existent. The inner then is the outer, and the outer is the inner. But to have that integration there must be a comprehension of the process of the mind.

Question : Please explain clearly what part memory has in our life. You seem to distinguish between two forms of memory. Actually, is there not only memory, which is our only means of consciousness, and that which makes us aware of time and space? Therefore, can we dispense with memory, as you seem to suggest?

KRISHNAMURTI: Let us investigate the question anew. Let us forget what has been said, and let us try to find out what we mean. We said this morning that thought is a result of the past, which is an obvious fact; whether you like it or not, it is so. Thought is founded on the past. There can be no thought without being conscious; and, as I said, consciousness is a process of experiencing, terming, which is recording. That is what you do all the time: if you see that, (pointing to a tree) you call it a tree and name it, and you think you have had an experience. This process of naming is part of memory, is it not? And it is a

very convenient way of experiencing. You think you have experienced a thing by naming it. You call me a Hindu, and you think you have understood all Hindus; I call you an American, and it is over. So we think we understand something by giving it a name. We give it a name in order to recognize it, as a species, or this or that; but that is not understanding, experiencing a thing. And we do it out of slackness—it is so much easier to dispense with people by giving them a name.

So, this process of experiencing, which is contact, sensation, desire, consciousness, identification, and experience—this process, with naming, is considered consciousness, isn't it? Part of that consciousness is awake, and the other part is dormant. The conscious mind, our every-day mind, the upper level of our mind, is awake. The rest is sleeping. Now, when we sleep, the conscious, upper mind, is silent; and therefore it is able to receive hints, intimations, translated as dreams, but which need further interpretation. Now, the questioner wants to know what we mean by memory, what is its function, and whether we can dispense with it. So, the question really is: What is the function of thought? Memory has no function apart from thinking. So, the question is, what is the function of thought? Can thought be divided at all? Is it to be dispensed with?

So, what is the function of thought? We say, thought is the response of memory, which it is; and memory is incomplete experience, termed and thought out for self-protection, and so on, and so on. Now, if thought is the result of memory, what function has thought in life? When do you use thought? I wonder if you have ever considered this? You use your thought when you want to go to your home, do you not? You think how to get to your place. This is one kind of thought. When does your thought function? When you are protecting yourself, isn't it? When you are seeking security: economic, social,

psychological. Isn't that so? When you want to safeguard yourself. That is, thought functions when there is the urge for self-protection. When you are kind to another, is that a thought process? When you love another, is that a thought process? When you love another and use that love as a means of self-enrichment, then obviously, it is a thought process; then, it is no longer love. So, thought process comes into being when there is fear, when there is the desire to possess, when there is conflict—in other words, thought process comes into being when the self, the me, becomes important. Surely? Because, after all, thought is concerned with me; when the I, the me, predominates, then the thought process as self-protection begins. Otherwise you don't think, you are unaware of your thought process, are you not? It is only when there is conflict that you are aware of the thought process—either to protect or to discard, to accept or to deny.

Now, the questioner wants to know what part memory plays in our life. If we understand that the thought process begins only when the me becomes important, and that the me is important only when there is the desire to safeguard itself, then we see that most of our life is spent in safeguarding ourselves. Therefore, thought has a very important part in our life; because most of us are concerned with ourselves. Most of us are concerned with how to protect ourselves, how to gain, how to arrive, how to achieve, how to become more perfect, how to have this virtue and that virtue, how to discard, how to deny, how to be detached, how to find happiness, how to be more beautiful, how to love, how to be loved—you know how we are concerned with ourselves.

So, we are consumed in the thought process. We are the thought process. We are not separate from the thought. And thought is memory; how to be more of something. That is, when there is the urge to be the more or

the less, the positive or the negative, then thought process comes into being. The thought process does not come into being when there is the recognition of what is. A fact does not demand a thought process; but if you want to avoid a fact, then the thought process begins. If I accept that I am what I am, then thought is not; but something else takes place when I accept what is. Quite a different process, which is not the process of thought, comes into being. So, as long as there is the desire for the more, or the less, there must be thought, there must be the process of memory. After all, if you want to be a very rich man, a powerful man, a popular man, or a man of God, if you want to become something, you must have memory. That is, you must think about it; the mind must constantly sharpen itself to become something.

Now, what part has that becoming in life? Surely, as long as we want to be something, there must be contention; as long as our desire, our urge, our pursuit, is to be the more, or to be the less—the positive or the negative—there must be strife, antagonism. But it is extremely arduous, extremely difficult, not to be the more or the less. Verbally you may throw it off and say, "I am nobody"; but that is merely living on the verbal level, without much significance—it is empty-headedness. That is why one has to understand the thought process, which is consciousness: which means, the whole problem of time, of yesterday, of to-morrow. And a man who is caught in yesterday, can never understand that which is timeless. And most of us are caught in the net of time. Our thought is basically entangled in the net of time—it is the net of time. Our thought is the net of time; and with that thought process—educated, cultivated, sharpened, made keen, subtle—we want to find something that is beyond.

We go to one teacher after another, one hero after another, one Master

after another. Our mind is sharpening itself on all these, and thereby hopes to find that which is beyond. But, thought can never find that which is beyond, because thought is the result of time, and that which is of the known, cannot receive the unknown. Therefore, the man who is entangled in the known is never creative; he may have moments of creativeness, as some painters do, some musicians, some writers; but they get entangled in the known—popularity, money, a hundred other things; and then they are lost. And that is why those who are trying to understand themselves—not to find, because that is a wrong process, you cannot find—, must cease to search. All that you can do is to understand yourself, understand the intricacies, the extraordinary subtlety of your thought and your being. And that can be understood only in relationship, which is action; and that action is denied when relationship is based on an idea; then relationship is mere activity, it is not action; and activity merely dulls the mind and the heart. It is only action that makes the mind alert and the heart subtle, so that it is capable of receiving, of being sensitive. That is why it is important that there be self-knowledge, before you seek. If you seek, you will find, but it will not be the truth. Therefore, this craze, this fear, this anxiety to arrive, to search out, to find, must end; then, with self-knowledge, ever wide and deep, there comes that sense of reality which cannot be invited. It comes into being, and only then is there creative happiness.

July 17, 1949.

III

Last Saturday and Sunday, we were discussing the importance of self-knowledge; because, as I explained, I do not see how we can have any foundation for right thinking without

self-knowledge ; how any action, however inclusive, however collective or individualistic, can possibly be a harmonious and true action, without fully knowing oneself. Without knowing oneself, there is no possibility of really searching out what is true, what is significant, what are the right values in life. Without self-knowledge, we cannot go beyond the self-projected illusions of the mind. Self-knowledge, as we explained, implies not only the action of relationship between one individual and another, but also the action of relationship with society ; and there can be no complete, harmonious society, without this knowledge. So, it is really very important and significant that one should know oneself as completely and fully as possible. And, is this knowledge possible ? Can one know *integrally*, not partially, the total process of oneself ? Because, as I said, without knowing oneself, one has no basis for thinking. One gets caught in illusions : political, religious, social illusions—they are limitless, endless. Is it possible to know oneself ? And, how is it possible to know oneself—what are the means, what are the ways, what are the processes ?

I think to find out what are the ways, one must find out first, must one not ?, what are the impediments ; and by studying what we consider important in life, those things which we have accepted—the values, the standards, the beliefs, the innumerable things that we hold—by examining them, perhaps we shall find out the ways of our own thinking, and thereby know ourselves. That is, by understanding the things that we accept, by questioning them, going into them—by that very process we shall know the ways of our own thinking, our responses, our reactions ; and through them, we shall know ourselves as we are. Surely, that is the only way we can find out the manner of our thinking, our responses : by studying, by going fully into the values, the standards, the beliefs, that

we have accepted for generations. And, seeing behind these values, we shall know how we respond, what our reactions are to them ; and thereby, perhaps, we shall be able to uncover the ways of our own thinking. In other words, to know oneself, surely, is to study the responses, the reactions that one has in relation to something. One cannot know oneself through isolation. That is an obvious fact. You may withdraw to a mountain, into a cave, or pursue some illusion on the banks of a river ; but, if one isolates oneself, there can be no relationship, and isolation is death. It is only in relationship that one can know oneself as one is. So, by studying the things that we have accepted, by going into them fully, not superficially, perhaps we shall be able to understand ourselves.

Now, one of the things, it seems to me, that most of us eagerly accept and take for granted, is the question of beliefs. I am not attacking beliefs. What we are trying to do this evening is to find out why we accept beliefs ; and if we can understand the motives, the causation of acceptance, then perhaps we may be able not only to understand why we do it, but also be free of it. Because, one can see how political and religious beliefs, national and various other types of beliefs, do separate people, do create conflict, confusion, and antagonism—which is an obvious fact ; and yet we are unwilling to give them up. There is the Hindu belief, the Christian belief, the Buddhist—innumerable sectarian and national beliefs, various political ideologies, all contending with each other, trying to convert each other. One can see, obviously, that belief is separating people, creating intolerance ; and is it possible to live without belief ? One can find that out, only if one can study oneself in relationship to a belief. Is it possible to live in this world without a belief—not change beliefs, not substitute one belief for another, but be entirely free from all beliefs, so that one meets life anew

each minute ? This, after all, is the truth : to have the capacity of meeting everything anew, from moment to moment, without the conditioning reaction of the past, so that there is not the cumulative effect which acts as a barrier between oneself and that which is.

Obviously, most of us accept or take on beliefs because, first of all, there is fear. We feel that, without a belief, we shall be lost. Then we use belief as a means of conduct, as a pattern, according to which we direct our lives. And also we think that, through belief, there can be collective action. So, in other words, we think that belief is necessary for action. And is that so ? Is belief necessary for action ? That is, belief being an idea, is ideation necessary for action ? Which comes first : idea, or action ? Surely, first there is action, which is either pleasurable or painful, and according to that we build up various theories. Action invariably comes first, does it not ? And, when there is fear, when there is the desire to believe in order to act, then ideation comes in.

Now, if you consider, you will see that one of the reasons for the desire to accept a belief, is fear. Because, if we had no belief, what would happen to us ? Wouldn't we be very frightened of what might happen ? If we had no pattern of action, based on a belief—either in God, or in Communism, or in Socialism, or in Imperialism, or in some kind of religious formula, some dogma in which we are conditioned—we would feel utterly lost, wouldn't we ? And is not this acceptance of a belief, the covering up of that fear—the fear of being really nothing, of being empty ? After all, a cup is useful only when it is empty ; and a mind that is filled with beliefs, with dogmas, with assertions, with quotations, is really an uncreative mind, it is merely a repetitive mind. And, to escape from that fear—that fear of emptiness, that fear of loneliness, that fear of stagnation, of not arriving, not succeeding, not

achieving, not being something, not becoming something—is surely one of the reasons, is it not ?, why we accept beliefs so eagerly and greedily. And, through acceptance of belief, do we understand ourselves ? On the contrary. A belief, religious or political, obviously hinders the understanding of ourselves. It acts as a screen through which we are looking at ourselves. And, can we look at ourselves without beliefs ? If we remove those beliefs, the many beliefs that one has, is there anything left to look at ? If we have no beliefs with which the mind has identified itself, then the mind, without identification, is capable of looking at itself as it is—and then, surely, there is the beginning of the understanding of oneself. If one is afraid, if there is fear which is covered over by a belief ; and if, in understanding beliefs, one comes face to face with fear, without the screen of beliefs—is it not possible then to be free from that reaction of fear ? That is, to know one is afraid, and to stay there, without any escape ? To be with what is, is surely much more significant, much more worthwhile, than to escape from what is, through a belief.

So, one begins to see that there are various forms of escape from oneself, from one's own emptiness, from one's own poverty of being—escapes such as knowledge, such as amusement, various forms of addictions and distractions, both learned and stupid, clever or not worthwhile. We are surrounded by these, we are them ; and if the mind can see the significance of the things to which it is held, then, perhaps, we shall be face to face with what we are, whatever it be ; and I think the moment we are capable of doing that, then there is a real transformation. Because then, there is no question of fear ; for fear exists only in relationship to something. When there is you and something else to which you are related, and when you dislike that thing to which you are related and try to avoid it—then there is fear. But

when you are that very thing, then there is no question of avoidance. A fact gives fear only when you bring an emotional reaction to it; but when a fact is faced as it is, there is no fear. And when what we call fear is no longer named, but only looked at, without it being given a term, then, surely, there takes place a revolution, there is no longer that sense either of avoidance or acceptance.

So, to understand belief, not superficially but profoundly, one must find out why the mind attaches itself to various forms of beliefs, why beliefs have become so significant in our lives: belief about death, about life, about what happens after death; beliefs asserting that there is God or there is no God; that there is reality or there is no reality; and various political beliefs. Are these beliefs not all indicative of our own sense of inward poverty, and, do they not reveal a process of escape, or act as a defence? And in studying our beliefs, do we not begin to know ourselves as we are, not only at the upper levels of our mind, of our consciousness, but deeper down? So, the more one studies oneself in relationship to something else, such as beliefs, the more the mind becomes quiet, without false regimentation, without compulsion. The more the mind knows itself, the more quiet it is, obviously. The more you know something, the more you are familiar with it, the more the mind becomes quiet. And the mind must be really quiet, not made quiet. Surely, there is a vast difference between a mind that is made quiet, and a mind that is quiet. You can compel a mind by circumstances, by various disciplines, tricks, and so on, to be quiet. But that is not quietude, that is not peace; that is death. But a mind that is quiet because it understands the various forms of fear, and because it understands itself—such a mind is creative, such a mind is renewing itself constantly. It is only the mind that is self-enclosed by its own fears and beliefs, that stagnates.

But a mind that understands its relationship to the values about it—not imposing a standard of values, but understanding what is—surely, such a mind becomes quiet, is quiet. It is not a question of becoming. It is only then, surely, that the mind is capable of perceiving what is real from moment to moment. Reality is, surely, not something at the end, an end-result of accumulative action. Reality is to be perceived only from moment to moment; and it can be perceived only when there is not the accumulative effect of the past on the moment, the now.

There are many questions, and I will answer some of them

Question : Why do you talk ?

KRISHNAMURTI : I think this question is quite interesting—for me to answer and also for you to answer. Not only why do I talk, but why do you listen? No; seriously, if I talked for self-expression, then I would be exploiting you. If my talking is a necessity for me in order to feel myself flattered, egotistic, self-aggressive, and all the rest of it, then I must use you; then you and I have no relationship, because you are a necessity for my egotism. I need you then to bolster myself up, to feel myself rich, free, applauded, having so many people listening to me. Then I am using you; then one uses another. Then, surely, there is no relationship between you and me, because you are useful to me. When I use you, what relationship have I with you? None. And, if I speak because I have various sets of ideas which I want to convey to you, then ideas become very important; and I do not believe that ideas ever bring about a fundamental, radical change, a revolution in life. Ideas can never be new; ideas can never bring about a transformation, a creative surge; because ideas are merely the response of a continued past, modified or altered,

but still of the past. If I talk because I want you to change, or I want you to accept my particular way of thinking, belong to my particular society, become my particular disciple—then you as an individual are a non-entity, because then I am only concerned with transforming you according to a particular view. Then you are not important; then the pattern is important.

So, why am I talking? If it is none of these things, why am I talking? We will answer that presently. Then the question is, why are you listening? Isn't that equally important? Perhaps more. If you are listening to get some new ideas, or a new way of looking at life, then you will be disappointed, because I am not going to give you new ideas. If you are listening to experience something you think I have experienced, then you are merely imitating, hoping to capture something which you think I have. Surely, the real things of life cannot be vicariously experienced. Or, because you are in trouble, sorrow, pain, have innumerable conflicts, you come here to find out how to get out of them. Again, I am afraid I cannot help you. All that I can do is to point out your own difficulty, and we can then talk it over with each other; but it is for you yourself to see. Therefore, it is very important to find out for yourself why you come here and listen. Because, if you have one purpose, one intention, and I another, we shall never meet. Then, there is no relationship between you and me, there is no communion between you and me. You want to go north, and I am going south. We will pass each other by. But, surely, that is not the intention of these gatherings. What we are trying to do is to undertake a journey together, and experience together as we go along—not that I am teaching you, or you are listening to me, but together we are exploring, if that is possible; so that you are not only the master but also the disciple in discovering and understanding. There

is not then this division of the high and the low, the one that is learned and the one that is ignorant, the one that has achieved and the one that is still on the way to achievement. Such divisions, surely, distort relationship; and, without understanding relationship, there can be no understanding of reality.

I have told you why I speak. Perhaps you will think then that I need you in order to discover. Surely not. I have something to say: you can take it or leave it. And, if you take it, it is not that you are taking it from me. I merely act as a mirror in which you see yourself. You might not like that mirror and so discard it; but, when you do look into the mirror, look at it very clearly, unemotionally, without the blur of sentimentality. And, surely, it is important, is it not?, to find out why you come and listen. If it is merely an afternoon's amusement, if instead of going to a cinema you come here, then it is utterly valueless. If it is merely for the sake of argumentation, or to catch new sets of ideas so that you can use them when you lecture, or write a book, or discuss—again, that is valueless. But if you come really to discover yourself in relationship, which might help in your relationship with others, then it has significance; then it is worthwhile; then it will not be like so many other meetings which you attend. Surely, these gatherings are intended, not for you to listen to me, but to see yourself reflected in the mirror which I am trying to describe. You don't have to accept what you see—that would be foolish. But if you look at the mirror dispassionately, as you would listen to music, as you would sit under a tree and watch the shadows of an evening, without condemnation, without any kind of justification—merely look at it—that very awareness of what is, does a most extraordinary thing, if there is no resistance. Surely, that is what we are trying to do in all these talks. So, real freedom comes, but

not through effort; effort can never bring about freedom. Effort can only bring about substitution, suppression, or sublimation; but none of those things is freedom. Freedom comes only when there is no longer effort to be something. Then, the truth of what is, acts; and that is freedom.

Question : Is there a distinction between my intention in listening to you, and in going from one teacher to another ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Surely, it is for you to find out, isn't it? Why do you go from one teacher to another, from one organization to another, from one belief to another? Or, why are you so closed in by one belief—Christian, or what you will? Why? Why do we do this? This is happening not in America only, but right through the world—this appalling restlessness, this desire to find. Why? Do you think by searching, you will find? But, before you can search, you must have the instrument for search, must you not? You must be capable of searching—not merely start out to search. To search, to have the capacity to search, you must understand yourself, surely. How can you search without first knowing yourself, without knowing what it is you are searching for, and what it is that is searching? The Hindus come over here and give their stuff—the yogis, the swamis, you know; and you go over there and preach, and convert. Why? It will be a happy world when there are neither teachers nor pupils.

What is it really that we are seeking? Is it that we are bored with life, bored with one set of ceremonies, one set of dogmas, church rituals, and so we go to another because it is something new, more exciting—Sanskrit words, men with beards, togas, and all the rest of it? Is that the reason? Or, do we want to find a refuge, an escape, in Buddhism, in Hinduism, or in some other organized religious

belief? Or, are we seeking gratification? It is very difficult to distinguish and be aware of what we are really seeking. Because, from period to period we vary; when we are bored, when we are tired, when we are miserable, we want something ultimate, lasting, final, absolute. It is only a very few who are consistent in their search—in their inquiry, rather. Most of us want distraction. If we are intellectual, we want intellectual distraction, and so on, and so on.

So, can one genuinely, authentically, for oneself, find out what it is that one wants? Not what one should have, or what one thinks one ought to have; but to find out for oneself, inwardly, what it is that one wants, what it is that one is searching after so ceaselessly. And, can one find, when one seeks? Surely, we will find that which we are seeking; but, when we get what we want, it soon fades away, it turns to ashes. So, before we start out searching, gathering what we want, surely it is important, isn't it?, to find out who the searcher is, and what he is seeking; because, if the seeker does not understand himself, then what he finds will be merely a self-projected illusion. And, you may live in that illusion happily for the rest of your life, but it will still be illusion.

So, before you seek, before you go from teacher to teacher, from organization to organization, from belief to belief, surely it is important to find out who is the person that is seeking, and what he is seeking—not just vaguely go from shop to shop, hoping to find the right dress. So, surely, the thing of primary importance is to know yourself, not to go out and search—which does not mean that you should become an introvert and avoid all action, which is impossible. You can know yourself only in relationship, not in isolation. So, what is the distinction between one's intention in coming here and listening, and in going to another teacher? Surely, there is no distinction if one merely

comes here to get something—to be pacified, to be comforted, to be given new ideas, to be persuaded to join or to leave some organization, or God knows what else. Surely, here there is no refuge, no organization. Here, you and I are trying to see exactly what is, if we can,—see ourselves as we are,—which is extremely difficult, because we are so cunning; you know the innumerable tricks that we play upon ourselves. Here, we are trying to strip ourselves naked and see ourselves; for, in that stripping, there comes wisdom; and it is that wisdom which gives happiness. But, if your intention is to find comfort, something which will hide you from yourself, something which will offer an escape, then, obviously, there are many ways of doing it—through religion, politics, amusement, knowledge—you know, the whole gamut of it. And, I do not see how any form of addiction, any form of distraction, any escape, however pleasant or however uncomfortable, to which one so eagerly adjusts oneself because it promises a reward at the end, can bring about that self-knowledge which is so essential, and which alone can give creative peace.

Question: Our mind knows only the known. What is it in us that drives us to find the unknown, reality, God?

KRISHNAMURTI: Does your mind urge towards the unknown? Is there an urge in us for the unknown, for reality, for God? Please think seriously about it. This is not a rhetorical question, but actually let us find out. Is there an inward urge in each one of us to find the unknown? Is there? How can you find the unknown? If you do not know it, how can you find it? Please, I am not being clever. Don't brush it off that way. So, is it an urge for reality? Or, is it merely a desire for the known, expanded? Do you understand what I mean? I have

known many things; they have not given me happiness, satisfaction, joy. So, now I want something else that will give me greater joy, greater happiness, greater hope, greater vitality—what you will. And, can the known, which is my mind—because, my mind is the known, the result of the known, the result of the past—can that mind seek the unknown? If I do not know reality, the unknown, how can I search for it? Surely, it must come, I cannot go after it. If I go after it, I am going after something which is the known, projected from me.

So, our problem is not what it is in us that drives us to find the unknown—that is clear enough. It is our own desire to be more secure, more permanent, more established, more happy, to escape from turmoil, from pain, confusion. Surely, that is our obvious drive. And, when there is that drive, that urge, you will find a marvellous escape, a marvellous refuge—in the Buddha, in the Christ, or in political slogans, and all the rest of it. But, surely, that is not reality; that is not the unknowable, the unknown. Therefore, the urge for the unknown must come to an end, the search for the unknown must stop; which means, there must be the understanding of the cumulative known, which is the mind. The mind must understand itself as the known, because that is all it knows. You cannot think about something that you do not know. You can only think about something that you know.

Our difficulty is for the mind not to proceed in the known; and that can only happen when the mind understands itself and how all its movement is from the past, projecting itself through the present, to the future. It is one continuous movement of the known; and, can that movement come to an end? It can come to an end only when the mechanism of its own process is understood, only when the mind understands itself and its workings, its ways, its purposes, its demands—not only

the superficial demands, but the deep inward urges and motives. This is quite an arduous task; it isn't just in a meeting, or at a lecture, or by reading a book, that you are going to find out. On the contrary, it needs constant watchfulness, constant awareness of every movement of thought—not only when you are waking, but also when you are asleep. It must be a total process, not a sporadic, partial process.

And also, the intention must be right. That is, there must be a cessation of the superstition that inwardly we all want the unknown. It is an illusion to think that we are all seeking God—we are not. We don't have to search for light. There will be light when there is no darkness; and through darkness, we cannot find the light. All that we can do is to remove those barriers that create darkness; and the removal depends on the intention. If you are removing them in order to see light, then you are not removing anything, you are only substituting the word light for darkness. Even to look beyond the darkness, is an escape from darkness.

So, we have to consider, not what it is that is driving us, but why there is in us such confusion, such turmoil, such strife and antagonism—all the stupid things of our existence. When these are not, then there is light, we don't have to look for it. When stupidity is gone, there is intelligence. But the man who is stupid and tries to become intelligent, is still stupid. Surely, stupidity can never be made wisdom; only when stupidity ceases, is there wisdom, intelligence. But the man who is stupid and tries to become intelligent, wise, obviously can never be. To know what is stupidity, one must go into it, not superficially, but fully, completely, deeply, profoundly, one must go into all the different layers of stupidity; and when there is the cessation of that stupidity, there is wisdom.

So, it is important to find out, not if there is something more, something greater than the known, which is

urging us to the unknown; but to see what it is in us that is creating confusion, the wars, the class differences, the snobbishness, the pursuit of the famous, the accumulation of knowledge, the escape through music, through art, through so many ways. It is important, surely, to see them as they are, and to come back to ourselves as we are. And, from there we can proceed. Then the throwing off of the known is comparatively easy. When the mind is silent, when it is no longer projecting itself into the future, into the tomorrow, wishing for something; when the mind is really quiet, profoundly peaceful, the unknown comes into being. You don't have to search for it. You cannot invite it. That which you can invite is only that which you know. You cannot invite an unknown guest. You can only invite one whom you know. But you do not know the unknown, God, reality, or what you will. It must come. It can come only when the field is ripe, when the soil is tilled. But, if you till in order for it to come, then you will not have it.

So, our problem is not to seek the unknowable, but to understand the accumulative processes of the mind, which is ever with the known. And that is an arduous task: that demands attention, that demands a constant awareness in which there is no sense of distraction, of identification, of condemnation; it is being with what is. Then only can the mind be still. No amount of meditation discipline, can make the mind still, in the real sense of that word. Only when the breezes stop does the lake become quiet. You cannot make the lake quiet. So, our job is not to pursue the unknowable, but to understand the confusion, the turmoil, the misery, in ourselves; and then that thing darkly comes into being, in which there is joy.

July 23, 1949

IV

I would like this morning to discuss what is simplicity, and perhaps from that arrive at the discovery of sensitivity. We seem to think that simplicity is merely an outward expression, a withdrawal: having few possessions, wearing a loin cloth, having no home, putting on few clothes, having a small bank account. Surely, that is not simplicity. That is merely an outward show. And it seems to me that simplicity is essential; but simplicity can come into being only when we begin to understand the significance of self-knowledge, which we have discussed previously, and which we will be discussing here till the end of August.

Simplicity is not merely adjustment to a pattern. It requires a great deal of intelligence to be simple and not merely conform to a particular pattern, however worthy outwardly. Unfortunately, most of us begin by being simple externally, in outward things. It is comparatively easy to have few things, and to be satisfied with few things; to be content with little, and perhaps to share that little with others. But, a mere outward expression of simplicity in things, in possessions, surely does not imply the simplicity of inward being. Because, as the world is at present, more and more things are being urged upon us, outwardly, externally. Life is becoming more and more complex. And, in order to escape from that, we try to renounce, or be detached from things—from cars, from houses, from organizations, from cinemas, and from the innumerable circumstances outwardly thrust upon us. We think we shall be simple by withdrawing. A great many saints, a great many teachers, have renounced the world; and it seems to me that such a renunciation on the part of any of us does not solve the problem. Simplicity which is fundamental, real, can only come into being inwardly; and from that there is

an outward expression. How to be simple, then, is the problem; because that simplicity makes one more and more sensitive. A sensitive mind, a sensitive heart, is essential, for then it is capable of quick perception, quick reception.

So, one can be inwardly simple, surely, only by understanding the innumerable impediments, attachments, fears, in which one is held. But most of us like to be held—by people, by possessions, or by ideas. We like to be prisoners. Inwardly, we are prisoners, though outwardly we seem very simple. Inwardly we are prisoners to our desires, to our wants, to our ideals, to the innumerable motivations. And simplicity cannot be found unless one is free inwardly. Therefore, it must begin first inwardly, not outwardly.

We were discussing yesterday afternoon the freedom from beliefs. Surely, there is an extraordinary freedom when one understands the whole process of belief, why the mind is attached to a belief. And, when there is freedom from beliefs, there is simplicity. But that simplicity requires intelligence; and, to be intelligent, one must be aware of one's own impediments. To be aware, one must be constantly on the watch, not established in any particular groove, in any particular pattern of thought or action. Because, after all, what one is inwardly, does affect the outer. Society, or any form of action, is the projection of ourselves; and, without transforming inwardly, mere legislation has very little significance outwardly; it may bring about certain reforms, certain adjustments; but, what one is inwardly, always overcomes the outer. If one is inwardly greedy, ambitious, pursuing certain ideals, that inward complexity does eventually upset, overthrow outward society, however carefully planned it may be.

So, surely, one must begin within—not exclusively, not rejecting the outer. You come to the inner, surely, by understanding the outer, by find-

ing out how the conflict, the struggle, the pain, exists outwardly ; and as one investigates it more and more, naturally one comes into the psychological states which produce the outward conflicts and miseries. The outward expression is only an indication of our inward state ; but to understand the inward state, one must approach through the outer. Most of us do that. And, in understanding the inner—not exclusively, not by rejecting the outer, but by understanding the outer and so coming upon the inner—, we will find that, as we proceed to investigate the inward complexities of our being, we become more and more sensitive, free. It is this inward simplicity that is so essential. Because, that simplicity creates sensitivity. A mind that is not sensitive, not alert, not aware, is incapable of any receptivity, any creative action. That is why I said that conformity as a means of making ourselves simple, really makes the mind and heart dull, insensitive. Any form of authoritarian compulsion, imposed by the government, by oneself, by the ideal of achievement, and so on—any form of conformity must make for insensitivity, for not being simple inwardly. Outwardly you may conform and give the appearance of simplicity, like so many religious people do. They practise various disciplines, join various organizations, meditate in a particular fashion, and so on—all giving an appearance of simplicity. But, such conformity does not make for simplicity. Compulsion of any kind can never lead to simplicity. On the contrary, the more you suppress, the more you substitute, the more you sublimate, the less there is simplicity ; but the more you understand the process of sublimation, suppression, substitution, the greater the possibility of being simple.

Our problems—social, environmental, political, religious—are so complex that we can solve them only by being simple, not by becoming extraordinarily erudite and clever. Be-

cause, a simple person sees much more directly, has a more direct experience, than the complex person. And, our minds are so crowded with an infinite knowledge of facts, of what others have said, that we have become incapable of being simple and having direct experience ourselves. These problems demand a new approach ; and they can be so approached only when we are simple, inwardly really simple. That simplicity comes only through self-knowledge, through understanding ourselves ; the ways of our thinking and feeling, the movements of our thoughts, our responses ; how we conform, through fear, to public opinion, to what others say, what the Buddha, the Christ, the great saints have said—all of which indicate our nature to conform, to be safe, to be secure. And, when one is seeking security, one is obviously in a state of fear, and therefore there is no simplicity.

Without being simple, one cannot be sensitive—to the trees, to the birds, to the mountains, to the wind, to all the things that are going on about us in the world. And, if one is not simple, one cannot be sensitive to the inward intimation of things. Most of us live so superficially, on the upper level of our consciousness ; there we try to be thoughtful or intelligent, which is synonymous with being religious ; there we try to make our minds simple, through compulsion, through discipline. But that is not simplicity. When we force the upper mind to be simple, such compulsion only hardens the mind, does not make the mind supple, clear, quick. To be simple, in the whole total process of our consciousness, is extremely arduous. Because, there must be no inward reservation, there must be an eagerness to find out, to inquire into the process of our being, which means, to be awake to every intimation, to every hint ; to be aware of our fears, of our hopes, and to investigate and be free of them more and more. Only then, when the mind and the heart are really simple, not encrusted,

are we able to solve the many problems that confront us.

Knowledge is not going to solve our problems. You may know, for example, that there is reincarnation, that there is a continuity after death. You may know, I don't say you do; or you may be convinced of it. But that does not solve the problem. Death cannot be shelved by your theory, or by information, or by conviction. It is much more mysterious, much deeper, much more creative, than that.

So, one must have the capacity to investigate all these things anew, because, it is only through direct experience that our problems are solved; and to have direct experience, there must be simplicity, which means, there must be sensitivity. A mind is made dull by the weight of knowledge. A mind is made dull by the past, by the future. But, only a mind that is capable of adjusting itself to the present, continually, from moment to moment, can meet the powerful influences and pressures constantly put upon us by our environment.

So, a religious man is not really one who puts on a robe, or a loin cloth, or lives on one meal a day, or one who has taken innumerable vows to be this and not to be that; but, it is he who is inwardly simple, who is not becoming anything. Such a mind is capable of extraordinary receptivity, because there is no barrier, there is no fear, there is no going toward something; therefore, it is capable of receiving grace, God, truth, or what you will. But a mind that is pursuing reality, is not a simple mind. A mind that is seeking out, searching, groping, agitated, is not a simple mind. A mind that conforms to any pattern of authority, inward or outward, cannot be sensitive. And it is only when a mind is really sensitive, alert, aware of all its own happenings, responses, thoughts, when it is no longer becoming, is no longer shaping itself to be something—only then is it capable of receiving that which

is truth. It is only then that there can be happiness; for happiness is not an end, it is the result of reality. And, when the mind and the heart have become simple, and therefore sensitive—not through any form of compulsion, direction, or imposition—then we will see that our problem can be tackled very simply. However complex our problems, we shall be able to approach them anew and see them differently. And that is what is wanted, is it not?, at the present time: people who are capable of meeting this outward confusion, turmoil, antagonism, anew, creatively, simply; not with theories, not with formulas, whether of the left or of the right. And you cannot meet it anew, if you are not simple.

You know, a problem can be solved only when we approach it anew. But we cannot approach it anew if we are thinking in terms of certain patterns of thought, religious, political, or otherwise. So, we must be free of all these things, to be simple. That is why it is so important to be aware, to have the capacity to understand the process of our own thinking, to be cognizant of ourselves, totally; and, from that comes a simplicity, there comes a humility which is not a virtue or a practice. Humility that is gained, ceases to be humility. A mind that makes itself humble, is no longer a humble mind. And it is only when one has humility, not a cultivated humility, that one is able to meet the things of life that are so pressing; because, then one is not important, one doesn't look through one's own pressures and sense of importance; one looks at the problem for itself, and then one is able to solve it.

Question: I have been a member of various religious organizations, but you have destroyed them all. I am utterly bored, and work because hunger forces me to it. It is difficult to get up in the morning, and I have no interest in life. I realize I am

merely existing from day to day, without any human sense of value; but I can feel no spark of enthusiasm for anything. I am afraid to commit suicide. What on earth am I to do? (Laughter)

KRISHNAMURTI: Though you laugh, are not most of us in that position? Though you may still belong to many organizations—religious, political and otherwise—or you may have given them all up, is there not in you the same inward despair? You may go to analysts, or to confession, and so feel pacified for the time being; but isn't there the same ache of loneliness, a sense of loss, a despair without end? Joining organizations, indulging in various forms of amusement, being addicted to knowledge, performing daily rituals, and all the rest of it, does offer an escape from ourselves; but, when those have ceased, when those have been pushed away intelligently and not replaced by other forms of escape, one comes to this, doesn't one? You may have read many books, you may be surrounded by your family, children, wealth—a new car every year, the latest literature, the newest phonograph, and all the rest of it. But, when you intelligently discard distraction, you are inevitably faced with this, aren't you?—the sense of inward frustration, the sense of hopeless despair without an end. Perhaps most of you are not aware of it; or, if you are, you run away from it. But it is there. So, what is one to do?

First of all, it seems to me, it is very difficult to come to that position; to be so aware that you are directly confronted with that thing. Very few of us are capable of facing that thing directly, as it is, because it is extremely painful; and when you do face it, you are so anxious to leave it, that you might do anything, even commit suicide—or run far away, into any illusion, any distraction. So, the first difficulty is to be fully aware that you are confronted with it. Surely, one must be in

despair to find something. When you have tried everything about you, every door through which you can possibly escape, and none of them offer an escape, you are bound to come to this point.

Now, if you are at this point, really, actually—not fancifully, not wishing to be there in order to do something else—if you are actually faced with it, then we can proceed and discuss what to do. Then it is worthwhile to proceed. If you have ceased substituting one escape for another, leaving one organization and joining something else, pursuing one thing after another: if all that has stopped—and it must eventually stop for every intelligent man—, then what? Now, if you are in that position, what is the next response? When you are no longer escaping, when you are no longer seeking an outlet, a way to avoid it—then what happens? If you observe, what we do is this: because of a sense of fear with regard to it, or the desire to understand it, we give it a name. Don't we? We say, "I am lonely, I am in despair; I am this, I want to understand it." That is, we establish a relationship between ourselves and that thing which we call loneliness, emptiness, by giving it a name. I hope you understand what I am talking about. By verbalizing our relationship to it, we give it a neurological as well as a psychological significance. But, if we do not name it, but merely regard it, look at it, then we shall have a different relationship to it; then it is not away from us, it is us. We say, for example, "I am afraid of it." Fear exists only in relationship to something; that something comes into being when we curb it, when we give it a name, as being lonely. Therefore, there is the feeling that you and that loneliness are two separate things. But is that so? You, the observer, are observing the fact, which you term as being lonely. Is the observer different from the thing which he observes? It is different only as long as he gives

.it a name; but if you do not give it a name, the observer is the observed. The name, the term, acts only to divide; and then you have to battle with that thing. But, if there is no division, if there is an integration between the observer and the observed, which exists only when there is no naming—you can try this out and you will see—, then the sense of fear is entirely gone. It is fear that is preventing you from looking at this when you say, you are empty, you are this, you are that, you are in despair. And fear exists only as memory, which comes when you term; but when you are capable of looking at it without terming, then, surely, that thing is yourself.

So, when you come to that point, when you are no longer naming the thing of which you are afraid, then you are that thing. When you are that thing, there is no problem, is there? It is only when you do not want to be that thing, or when you want to make that thing different from what it is, that the problem arises. But if you are that thing, then the observer is the observed, they are a joint phenomenon, not separate phenomena; then there is no problem, is there?

Please, experiment with this, and you will see how quickly that thing is resolved and transcended, and something else takes place. Our difficulty is to come to that point, when we can look at it without fear; and fear arises only when we begin to recognize it, when we begin to give it a name, when we want to do something about it. But, when the observer sees that he is not different from the thing which he calls emptiness, despair, then the word has no longer a meaning. The word has ceased to be, it is no longer despair. When the word is removed, with all its implications, then there is no sense of fear or despair. Then, if you proceed further, when there is no fear, no despair, when the word is no longer important, then, surely, there is a tremendous release, a freedom:

and in that freedom there is creative being, which gives a newness to life.

To put it differently: We approach this problem of despair through habitual channels. That is, we bring our past memories to translate that problem; and thought, which is the result of memory, which is founded upon the past, can never solve that problem, because it is a new problem. Every problem is a new problem; and when you approach it, burdened with the past, it cannot be solved. You cannot approach it through the screen of words, which is the thinking process; but when the verbalization stops—because you understand the whole process of it, you leave it—, then you are able to meet the problem anew; then the problem is not what you think it is.

So, you might say at the end of this question. "What am I to do? Here I am in despair, in confusion, in pain; you haven't given me a method to follow, to become free." But, surely, if you have understood what I have said, the key is there: a key which opens much more than you realize if you are capable of using it. You can see then how words play an extraordinarily important part in our lives, words like God, like nation, like political leader, like Communism, like Catholicism—words, words, words. What extraordinary significance they have in our life! And it is these words that are preventing our understanding the problems anew. To be really simple is to be uncluttered with all these impressions, words and their significance; and to approach the problem anew. And I assure you, you can do it; it is quite an amusement, if you will do it, for it reveals so much. And I feel this is the only way to tackle any fundamental problem. You must tackle a problem which is very deep, profoundly, not at the superficial level. And this problem of loneliness, of despair, with which most of us are somewhat, in our rare moments, acquainted, is not a thing to be dis-

solved by merely running off into some kind of distraction or worship. It is always there, until you are capable of dealing with it directly and experiencing it directly, without any verbalization, without any screen between yourself and it.

Question: What have you to say to a person who, in quiet moments, sees the truth of what you say, who has a longing to keep awake, but who finds himself repeatedly lost in a sea of impulse and small desires?

KRISHNAMURTI: This is what happens to most of us, isn't it? We are awake at moments, at other moments we are asleep. At moments we see everything clearly, with significance; at other moments all is confused, dark, misty. Sometimes there are extraordinary heights of joy, unrelated to any kind of action; at other moments, we struggle for that. Now, what is one to do? Should one memorize, keep awake to those things that we have caught a glimpse of, and hang on to them grimly? Or, should we deal with the little desires, impulses, the dark things of our life, as they arise from moment to moment? I know most of us prefer to cling to that joy; we make effort, discipline ourselves to resist, to overcome the petty little things, and try to keep our eyes fixed on the horizon. That is what most of us want, isn't it? Because that is so much easier—at least, we think so. We prefer to look to an experience that is over, that has given us a great delight, a joy, and hold on to it, like some old people who look to their youth; or, like some other people, who look to the future, to the next life, to some greatness which they are going to achieve next time, tomorrow, or a hundred years hence. That is, there are those who sacrifice the present to the past, enriching the past; and those who enrich the future. They are both the same. Different sets of words

are employed, but the same phenomenon is there.

Now, what is one to do? First of all, let us find out why we want to cling to a pleasurable experience, or avoid something which is not pleasurable. Why do we go through this process of holding on, clinging to something which has given us a great joy physically or psychologically? Why do we do this? Why has an experience that is over, so much more importance? Because, don't we feel that without that extraordinary experience, there is nothing in the present? The present is an awful bore, a trial; therefore, let us think of the past. The present is irksome, nagging, bothersome, therefore, let us at least be something in the future—a Buddha, a Christ, or God knows what.

So, the past and the future become useful, or pleasurable, only when we do not understand the present. And against the present, we discipline; the present, we resist. Because, take away the past, all your experiences, your knowledge, your accumulations, your enrichments—and what are you? With that past, you meet the present. Therefore, you are really never meeting the present: you are merely overshadowing the present by the past, or by the future. And, we discipline ourselves to understand the present. We say, "I must not think of the past, I must not think of the future; I am going to be concentrated in the present." You see the fallacy, the absurdity, the infantilism of thinking yourself as some marvellous entity tomorrow, or in the past, and you say, "Now I must understand it." Can you understand anything through discipline, through compulsion? You may force a boy to be quiet, outwardly, by disciplining him; but inwardly, he is seething, isn't he? Likewise, when we force ourselves to understand, is there any understanding? But, if we can see the real futility, see the significance of our attachment to the past, or to our becoming something in the

future—if we really understand it—, then that gives sensitivity to the mind, to meet the present.

So, our difficulty is not the understanding of the present. Our difficulty is our attachment to the past or to the future. So, we have to investigate why it is that we are attached. Why is the past so important to old people, as the future is to others? Why are we so attached to it? Because we think, do we not?, that the experiences have enriched us; so, the past has significance. When one was young, one caught a light on the sea, a glimmer: there was a freshness which has faded now. But, at least one can remember that glimmer, that extraordinary sense of élan, that feeling of otherness, of youth. So, one goes back and lives there. That is, one lives in a dead experience. It is over, it is dead, it is gone; yet, one gives it life by thinking about it, living in it. But it is a dead thing. So, when one does that, one is also dead in the present—like so many people are—or in the future. In other words, one is afraid to be nothing in the present, to be simple, to be sensitive to the present, so one wants to be enriched by one's experiences of yesterday. Is that enrichment? Are the experiences of yesterday enriching? Surely, you have the memory of them. Is memory enriching? Or, is it merely words, with very little content? Surely, you can see that for yourself, if you will experiment. When we look to the past for enrichment, we are living on words. We give life to the past: the past has no life in itself; it has life only in relationship to the present. And when the present is disagreeable, we give life to the past; and that, surely, is not enrichment. When you are aware that you are rich, you are surely poor. To be aware of yourself as being something, obviously denies that which you are. If you are aware that you are virtuous, surely, you are no longer virtuous; if you are aware that you are happy, where is happiness?

Happiness comes only when there is self-forgetfulness, when there is no sense of the me as important. But, the me becomes important, the self becomes important, when the past or the future is all-significant. So, mere disciplining of oneself to be something, can never bring about that state in which there is no self-consciousness as the me.

Question: I am not interested in anything, but most people are busy with many interests. I don't have to work, so I don't. Should I undertake some useful work?

KRISHNAMURTI: Become a social worker, or a political worker, or a religious worker—is that it? Because you have nothing else to do, therefore you become a reformer! (Laughter) Sir, if you have nothing to do, if you are bored, why not be bored? Why not be that? If you are in sorrow, be sorrowful. Don't try to find a way out of it. Because, your being bored has an immense significance, if you can understand it, live with it. But if you say, "I am bored, therefore I will do something else," you are merely trying to escape from boredom. And, as most of our activities are escapes, you do much more harm socially and in every other way. The mischief is much greater when you escape, than when you are what you are and remain with it. The difficulty is, how to remain with it, and not run away; and as most of our activities are a process of escape, it is immensely difficult for you to stop escaping, and face it. So, I am glad if you are really bored; and I say: full stop, let's stay there, let's look at it. Why should you do anything? How do you know that in that state, when you are escaping, you are not causing much more harm to people? Your escape into something is an illusion; and when you go into an illusion and propagate that illusion, you are doing much mere harm, aren't you?, than by

remaining bored. Sir, if you are bored, and remain so, what can you do? This person says he has enough money to live, so he has not that problem for the time being.

If you are bored, why are you bored? What is the thing called boredom? Why is it that you are not interested in anything? There must be reasons and causes which have made you dull: suffering, escapes, beliefs, incessant activity, have made the mind dull, the heart unphable. To find out what are the causes that have made you dull, is not to analyze. That is quite a different problem which we will discuss another time. But, if you could find out why you are bored, why there is no interest, then surely you would solve the problem, wouldn't you? Then the awakened interest will function. But, if you are not interested in why you are bored, you cannot force yourself to be interested in an activity, merely to be doing something—like a squirrel going around in a cage. I know that this is the kind of activity most of us indulge in. But, we can find out inwardly, psychologically, why we are in this state of utter boredom; we can see why most of us are in this state: we have exhausted ourselves emotionally and mentally; we have tried so many things, so many sensations, so many amusements, so many experiments, that we have become dull, weary. We join one group, do everything wanted of us, and then leave it; we then go to something else, and try that. If we fail with one psychologist, we go to somebody else, or to the priest; if we fail there, we go to another teacher, and so on; we always keep going. This process of constantly stretching and letting go, is exhausting, isn't it? Like all sensations, it soon dulls the mind.

So, we have done that, we have gone from sensation to sensation, from excitement to excitement, till we come to a point when we are really exhausted. Now, realizing that, don't proceed any further: take a rest. Be quiet. Let the mind

gather strength by itself, don't force it. As the soil renews itself during the winter-time, so, when the mind is allowed to be quiet, it renews itself. But it is very difficult to allow the mind to be quiet, to let it lie fallow after all this, for the mind wants to be doing something all the time. And when you come to that point where you are really allowing yourself to be as you are—bored, ugly hideous, or whatever it is—, then there is a possibility of dealing with it.

What happens when you accept something, when you accept what you are? When you accept that you are what you are, where is the problem? There is a problem only when we do not accept a thing as it is, and wish to transform it—which does not mean that I am advocating contentment; on the contrary. So, if we accept what we are, then we see that the thing which we dreaded, the thing which we called boredom, the thing which we called despair, the thing which we called fear, has undergone a complete change. There is a complete transformation of the thing of which we were afraid.

That is why it is important, as I said, to understand the process, the ways of our own thinking. Self-knowledge cannot be gathered through anybody, through any book, through any confession, psychology, or psycho-analyst. It has to be found by yourself, because it is your life; and without the widening and deepening of that knowledge of the self, do what you will, alter any outward or inward circumstances, influences—it will ever be a breeding ground of despair, pain, sorrow. To go beyond the self-enclosing activities of the mind, you must understand them; and to understand them is to be aware of action in relationship, relationship to things, to people, and to ideas. In that relationship, which is the mirror, we begin to see ourselves, without any justification or condemnation; and from that wider and deeper knowledge of the ways of our own mind, it is possible to proceed

further ; then it is possible for the mind to be quiet, to receive that which is real.

July 24, 1949

V

During the last four talks or discussions we have been considering the question of self-knowledge. Because, as we said, without being aware of one's own process of thought and feeling, it is obviously not possible to act rightly or think rightly. So, the essential purpose of these gatherings or discussions or meetings is really to see if one can, for oneself, directly experience the process of one's own thinking and be aware of it integrally. Most of us are aware of it superficially, on the upper or superficial level of the mind, but not as a total process. It is this total process that gives freedom, that gives comprehension, that gives understanding ; and not the partial process. Some of us may know ourselves partially, at least we think we know ourselves a little ; but that little is not sufficient, because, if one knows oneself slightly, it acts as a hindrance rather than a help. And it is only in knowing oneself as a total process —physiologically and psychologically: the hidden, unconscious, deeper layers as well as the superficial layers—it is only when we know the total process, that we are able to deal with the problems that inevitably arise, not partially but as a whole.

Now, this ability to deal with the total process is what I would like to discuss this evening ; also whether it is a question of the cultivation of a particular capacity, which implies a certain kind of specialization. Does understanding, happiness, the realization of something beyond the mere physical sensations, come through any specialization ? Because, capacity implies specialization. In a world of ever-increasing specializa-

tion, we depend on the specialists. If anything goes wrong with a car, we turn to the mechanic ; if anything goes wrong physically, we go to a doctor. If there is a psychological maladjustment, we run, if we have the money and the means, to a psychologist, or to a priest, and so on. That is, we look to the specialist for help in our failures and miseries.

Now, does the understanding of ourselves demand specialization ? The specialist knows only his specialty at whatever level. And does the knowledge of ourselves demand specialization ? I do not think so ; on the contrary. Specialization implies, does it not ?, a narrowing-down of the whole, total process of our being to a particular point, and specializing on that point. Since we have to understand ourselves as a total process, we cannot specialize. Because specialization implies exclusion, obviously ; whereas, to know ourselves does not demand any kind of exclusion. On the contrary, it demands a complete awareness of ourselves as an integral process, and for that, specialization is a hindrance.

After all, what is it that we have to do ? Know ourselves, which means to know our relationship with the world, surely—not only with the world of ideas and people, but also with nature, with the things we possess. That is our life—life being relationship to the whole. And does the understanding of that relationship demand specialization ? ; obviously not. What it demands is awareness to meet life as a whole. How is one to be aware ? That is our problem. How is one to have that awareness—if I may use this word without making it mean specialization ? How is one to be capable of meeting life as a whole ?—which means not only personal relationship with your neighbor, but also with nature, with the things that you possess, with ideas, and with the things that the mind manufactures as illusion, desire, and so on. How is one to be aware of this whole process

of relationship? Surely, that is our life, is it not? There is no life without relationship; and to understand this relationship does not mean isolation, as I have been insisting, constantly explaining. On the contrary, it demands a full recognition or awareness of the total process of relationship.

Now, how is one to be aware? How are we aware of anything? How are you aware of your relationship with a person? How are you aware of these trees, the calling of that cow? How are you aware of your reactions when you read a newspaper, if you read a newspaper? And, are we aware of the superficial responses of the mind, as well as the inner responses? How are we aware of anything? Surely, first we are aware, are we not?, of a response to a stimulus, which is an obvious fact; I see the trees, and there is a response, then sensation, contact, identification, and desire. That is the ordinary process, isn't it? We can observe what actually takes place, without studying any books.

So, through identification, you have pleasure and pain. And our 'capacity' is this concern with pleasure and the avoidance of pain, is it not? If you are interested in something, if it gives you pleasure, there is 'capacity' immediately; there is an awareness of that fact immediately; and if it is painful, the 'capacity' is developed to avoid it. So, as long as we are looking to 'capacity' to understand ourselves, I think we shall fall; because the understanding of ourselves does not depend on capacity. It is not a technique that you develop, cultivate and increase through time, through constantly sharpening. This awareness of oneself can be tested, surely, in the action of relationship, it can be tested in the way we talk, the way we behave. Watch yourself after the meeting is over, watch yourself at table—just observe, without any identification, without any comparison, without any condemnation; just watch, and you will

see an extraordinary thing taking place. You not only put an end to an activity which is unconscious—because most of our activities are unconscious—you not only bring that to end, but, further, you are aware of the motives of that action, without inquiry, without digging into it

Now, when you are aware, you see the whole process of your thinking and action; but it can happen only when there is no condemnation. That is, when I condemn something, I do not understand it, and it is one way of avoiding any kind of understanding. I think most of us do that purposely; we condemn immediately, and we think we have understood. If we do not condemn, but regard it, are aware of it, then the content, the significance of that action begins to open up. Experiment with this and you will see for yourself. Just be aware—without any sense of justification—which may appear rather negative, but is not negative. On the contrary, it has the quality of passivity which is direct action; and you will discover this, if you experiment with it.

After all, if you want to understand something, you have to be in a passive mood, do you not? You cannot keep on thinking about it, speculating about it, or questioning it. You have to be sensitive enough to receive the content of it. It is like being a sensitive photographic plate. If I want to understand you, I have to be passively aware; then you begin to tell me all of your story. Surely, that is not a question of capacity or specialization. In that process, we begin to understand ourselves—not only the superficial layers of our consciousness, but the deeper, which is much more important; because there are all of our motives or intentions, our hidden, confused demands, anxieties, fears, appetites. Outwardly we may have them all under control, but inwardly they are boiling. Until those have been completely understood through awareness, obviously there cannot be freedom, there can-

not be happiness, there is no intelligence.

So, is intelligence a matter of specialization?—intelligence being the total awareness of our process. And is that intelligence to be cultivated through any form of specialization? Because, that is what is happening, is it not? You are listening to me, probably thinking that I am a specialist—I hope not. The priest, the doctor, the engineer, the industrialist, the business man, the professor—we have the mentality of all that specialization. And we think that to realize the highest form of intelligence—which is truth, which is God, which cannot be described—to realize that, we have to make ourselves specialists. We study, we grope, we search out; and with the mentality of the specialist, or looking to the specialist, we study ourselves, in order to develop a capacity which will help to unravel our conflicts, our miseries.

So, our problem is, if we are at all aware, whether the conflicts and the miseries and the sorrows of our daily existence can be solved by another; and if they cannot, how is it possible for us to tackle them? To understand a problem, obviously requires a certain intelligence; and that intelligence cannot be derived from, or cultivated through, specialization. It comes into being only when we are passively aware of the whole process of our consciousness, which is to be aware of ourselves without choice, without choosing what is right and what is wrong. Because, when you are passively aware, you will see that out of that passivity—which is not idleness, which is not sleep, but extreme alertness—the problem has quite a different significance; which means, there is no longer identification with the problem, and therefore there is no judgment, and hence the problem begins to reveal its content. If you are able to do that constantly, continuously, then every problem can be solved fundamentally, not superficially. And that is the diffi-

culty, because most of us are incapable of being passively aware, letting the problem tell the story without our interpreting it. We do not know how to look at a problem dispassionately—if you like to use that word. Unfortunately, we are not capable of doing that, because we want a result from the problem, we want an answer, we are looking to an end; or we try to translate the problem according to our pleasure or pain; or we have an answer already, how to deal with the problem. Therefore, we approach a problem, which is always new, with the old pattern. The challenge is always the new, but our response is always the old; and our difficulty is to meet the challenge adequately, that is, fully. The problem is always a problem of relationship, there is no other problem; and to meet the problem of relationship, with its constantly varying demands—to meet it rightly, to meet it adequately—one has to be aware, passively; and this passivity is not a question of determination, of will, of discipline; to be aware that we are not passive, is the beginning. To be aware that we want a particular answer to a particular problem—surely, that is the beginning: to know ourselves in relationship to the problem, and how we deal with the problem. Then, as we begin to know ourselves in relationship to the problem,—how we respond, what are our various prejudices, demands, pursuits, in meeting that problem—this awareness will reveal the process of our own thinking, of our own inward nature; and in that there is a release.

So, life is a matter of relationship; and to understand that relationship, which is not static, there must be an awareness which is pliable, an awareness which is alertly passive, not aggressively active. And as I said, this passive awareness does not come through any form of discipline, through any practice. It is to be just aware, from moment to moment, of our thinking and feeling, not only

when we are awake ; for we will see, as we go into it deeper, that we begin to dream, that we begin to throw up all kinds of symbols which we translate as dreams. So, we open the door into the hidden, which becomes the known ; but to find the unknown, we must go beyond the door—surely, that is our difficulty. Reality is not a thing that is knowable by the mind, because the mind is the result of the known, of the past ; therefore, the mind must understand itself and its functioning, its truth, and only then is it possible for the unknown to be.

Question : All religions have insisted on some kind of self-discipline to moderate the instincts of the brute in man. Through self-discipline the saints and mystics have asserted that they have attained Godhood. Now, you seem to imply that such disciplines are a hindrance to the realization of God. I am confused. Who is right in this matter ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Surely, it is not a question of who is right in this matter. What is important is to find out the truth of the matter for ourselves—not according to a particular saint, or to a person who comes from India, or from some other place, the more exotic the better. So let us examine it together.

Now, you are caught between these two : someone says discipline, another says no discipline. Generally what happens is, you choose what is more convenient, what is more satisfying : you like the man, his looks, his personal idiosyncrasies, his personal favouritism, and all the rest of it. So, putting all that aside, let us examine this question directly and find out the truth of the matter for ourselves. Because, in this question a great deal is implied, and we have to approach it very cautiously and tentatively.

Most of us want someone in authority to tell us what to do. We look for a direction in conduct, because

our instinct is to be safe, not to suffer more. Someone is said to have realized happiness, bliss, or what you will, and we hope that he will tell us what to do to arrive there. That is what we want : we want that same happiness, that same inward quietness, joy ; and in this mad world of confusion, we want someone to tell us what to do. That is really the basic instinct with most of us ; and, according to that instinct, we pattern our action. Is God, is that highest thing, unnamable and not to be measured by words—is that come by through discipline, through following a particular pattern of action ? Please, we are thinking it out together,—don't bother about the rain for the time being. If you are interested, let us go into it. We want to arrive at a particular goal, particular end, and we think that by practice, by discipline, by suppressing or releasing, sublimating or substituting, we shall be able to find that which we are seeking.

What is implied in discipline ? Why do we discipline ourselves, if we do ? I doubt if we do—but why do we do it ? Now, seriously, why do we do it ? Can discipline and intelligence go together ? Let us enquire into it fully and see how far—if the rain allows us—we can go into this matter. Because, most people feel that we must, through some kind of discipline, subjugate, or control the brute, the ugly thing in us. And is that brute, that ugly thing, controllable through discipline ? What do we mean by discipline ? A course of action which promises a reward ; a course of action which, if pursued, will give us what we want—it may be positive or negative. A pattern of conduct which, if practised diligently, sedulously, very, very ardently, will give me in the end what I want. It may be painful, but I am willing to go through it to get that. That is, the self, which is aggressive, selfish, hypocritical, anxious, fearful—you know, all of it—that self, which is the cause of the brute in us, we want

to transform, subjugate, destroy. And how is this to be done? Is it to be done through discipline, or through an intelligent understanding of the past of the self, what the self is, how it comes into being, and so on? That is, shall we destroy the brute in man through compulsion, or through intelligence? And is intelligence a matter of discipline? Let us for the time being forget what the saints and all the rest of the people have said—and I do not know if they have said it; not that I am an expert on saints. But let us go into the matter for ourselves, as though we were for the first time looking at this problem; then we may have something creative at the end of it, not just quotations of what other people have said, which is all so vain and useless.

We first say that in us there is conflict, the black against the white, greed against non-greed, and so on. I am greedy, which creates pain; and to be rid of that greed, I must discipline myself. That is, I must resist any form of conflict which gives me pain, which in this case I call greed. I then say it is anti-social, it is unethical, it is not salutary, and so on, and so on—the various social-religious reasons we give for resisting it. Is greed destroyed or put away from us through compulsion? First, let us examine the process involved in suppression, in compulsion, in putting it away, resisting. What happens when you do that, when you resist greed? What is the thing that is resisting greed? That is the first question, isn't it? Why do you resist greed, and who is the entity that says, "I must be free of greed"? The entity that says, "I must be free" is also greed, is he not? Because, up to now, greed has paid him; but now it is painful, therefore he says, "I must get rid of it." The motive to get rid of it, is still a process of greed, because he is wanting to be something which he is not. Non-greed is now profitable, so I am pursuing non-greed; but the motive,

the intention, is still to be something, to be non-greedy—which is still greed, surely; which is again a negative form of the emphasis on the me.

So, we find that being greedy is painful, for various reasons which are obvious. As long as we enjoy it, as long as it pays us to be greedy, there is no problem. Society encourages us in different ways to be greedy; so do religions encourage us in different ways. As long as it is profitable, as long as it is not painful, we pursue it. But the moment it becomes painful, we want to resist it. That resistance is what we call discipline against greed; but are we free from greed through resistance, through sublimation, through suppression? Any act on the part of the me who wants to be free from greed, is still greed. Therefore, any action, any response on my part with regard to greed, is obviously not the solution.

First of all, there must be a quiet mind, an undisturbed mind, to understand anything, especially something which I do not know, something which my mind cannot fathom—which, this questioner says, is God. To understand anything, any intricate problem—of life or relationship, in fact any problem—, there must be a certain quiet depth to the mind. And is that quiet depth come by through any form of compulsion? The superficial mind may compel itself, make itself quiet; but surely, such quietness is the quietness of decay, death. It is not capable of adaptability, pliability, sensitivity. So, resistance is not the way.

Now, to see that, requires intelligence, doesn't it? To see that the mind is made dull by compulsion, is already the beginning of intelligence, isn't it?—to see that discipline is merely conformity to a pattern of action through fear. Because, that is what is implied in disciplining ourselves: we are afraid of not getting what we want. And what happens when you discipline the mind, when you discipline your being? Surely, it becomes very hard, doesn't it?

unpliable, not quick, not adjustable. Don't you know people who have disciplined themselves—if there are such people? The result is obviously a process of decay. There is an inward conflict which is put away, hidden away; but it is there, burning.

So, we see that discipline, which is resistance, merely creates a habit, and habit obviously cannot be productive of intelligence: habit never is, practice never is. You may become very clever with your fingers by practising the piano all day, making something with your hands; but intelligence is demanded to direct the hands, and we are now inquiring into that intelligence.

You see somebody whom you consider happy or as having realized, and he does certain things; and you, wanting that happiness, imitate him. This imitation is called discipline, isn't it? We imitate in order to receive what another has; we copy in order to be happy, which you think he is. Is happiness found through discipline? And, by practising a certain rule, by practising a certain discipline, a mode of conduct, are you ever free? Surely, there must be freedom for discovery, must there not? If you would discover anything, you must be free inwardly, which is obvious. Are you free by shaping your mind in a particular way, which you call discipline? Obviously, you are not. You are merely a repetitive machine, resisting according to a certain conclusion, according to a certain mode of conduct. So, freedom cannot come through discipline. Freedom can only come into being with intelligence; and that intelligence is awakened, or you have that intelligence, the moment you see that any form of compulsion denies freedom, inwardly or outwardly.

So, the first requirement, not as a discipline, is obviously freedom; and only virtue gives that freedom. Greed is confusion; anger is confusion; bitterness is confusion. When you see that, obviously you are free

of them—not that you are going to resist them, but you see that only in freedom can you discover; and that any form of compulsion is not freedom, and therefore there is no discovery. Surely, what virtue does, is to give you freedom. The unvirtuous person is a confused person, and in confusion, how can you discover anything? How can you? So, virtue is not the end-product of a discipline, but virtue is freedom, and freedom cannot come through any action which is not virtuous, which is not true in itself. Our difficulty is that most of us have read so much, most of us have superficially followed so many disciplines—getting up every morning at a certain hour, sitting in a certain posture, trying to hold our minds in a certain way—you know, practise, practise, discipline. Because you have been told that if you do these things you will get there; if you do these things for a number of years, you will have God at the end of it. I may put it crudely, but that is the basis of our thinking. Surely, God doesn't come so easily as all that. God is not a mere marketable thing: I do this, and you give me that.

Most of us are so conditioned by external influences, by religious doctrines, beliefs, and by our own inward demand to arrive at something, to gain something, that it is very difficult for us to think of this problem anew, without thinking in terms of discipline. So, first we must see very clearly the implications of discipline, how it narrows down the mind, limits the mind, compels the mind to a particular action, through our desire, through influence, and all the rest of it; and a conditioned mind, however 'virtuous' that conditioning, cannot possibly be free, and therefore cannot understand reality. And, God, reality, or what you will—the name doesn't matter—, can come into being only when there is freedom; and there is no freedom where there is compulsion, positive or negative, through fear. There is no freedom if you are seeking an end, for

you are tied to that end. You may be free from the past, but the future holds you, and that is not freedom. And it is only in freedom that one can discover anything: a new idea, a new feeling, a new perception. And surely, any form of discipline which is based on compulsion denies that freedom, whether political or religious. And since discipline, which is conformity to an action with an end in view, is binding, the mind can never be free. It can function only within that groove, like a gramophone record.

So, through practice, through habit, through cultivation of a pattern, the mind only achieves what it has in view. Therefore, it is not free; therefore, it cannot realize that which is immeasurable. To be aware of that whole process—why you are constantly disciplining yourself to public opinion, to certain saints, you know, the whole business of conforming to opinion, whether of a saint or of the neighbor, it is all the same—to be aware of this whole conformity through practice, through subtle ways of submitting yourself, of denying, asserting, suppressing, sublimating, all implying conformity to a pattern: to be aware of that, is already the beginning of freedom, from which there is virtue. Virtue, surely, is not the cultivation of a particular idea. Non-greed, for instance, if pursued as an end is no longer virtue, is it? That is, if you are conscious that you are non-greedy, are you virtuous? And yet that is what we are doing through discipline.

So, discipline, conformity, practice, only gives emphasis to self-consciousness as being something. The mind practises non-greed, and therefore it is not free from its own consciousness as being non-greedy; therefore, it is not really non-greedy. It has merely taken on a new cloak which it calls non-greed. We can see the total process of all this: the motivation, the desire for an end, the conformity to a pattern, the desire to be secure in

pursuing a pattern—all this is merely the moving from the known to the known, always within the limits of the mind's own self-enclosing process. To see all this, to be aware of it, is the beginning of intelligence; and intelligence is neither virtuous nor non-virtuous, it cannot be fitted into a pattern as virtue or non-virtue. Intelligence brings freedom, which is not licentiousness, not disorder. Without this intelligence there can be no virtue; and virtue gives freedom, and in freedom there comes into being, reality. If you see the whole process totally, in its entirety, then you will find there is no conflict. It is because we are in conflict, and because we want to escape from that conflict, that we resort to various forms of disciplines, denials and adjustments. But, when we see what is the process of conflict, then there is no question of discipline, because then we understand from moment to moment the ways of conflict. That requires great alertness, watching yourself all the time; and the curious part of it is that, although you may not be watchful all the time, there is a recording process going on inwardly, once the intention is there—the sensitivity, the inner sensitivity, is taking the picture all the time, so that the inner will project that picture the moment you are quiet.

So, again, it is not a question of discipline. Sensitivity can never come into being through compulsion. You may compel a child to do something, put him in a corner, and he may be quiet; but inwardly he is probably seething, looking out of the window, doing something to get away. That is what we are still doing. So, the question of discipline, and who is right and who is wrong, can be solved only by yourself. Because, there is much more involved in this than what I have just said.

Also, you see, we are afraid to go wrong, because we want to be a success. Fear is at the bottom of the desire to be disciplined: but the unknown cannot be caught in the net

of discipline. On the contrary, the unknown must have freedom and not the pattern of your mind. That is why the tranquillity of the mind is essential. When the mind is conscious that it is tranquil, it is no longer tranquil; when the mind is conscious that it is non-greedy, free from greed, it recognizes itself in the new robe of non-greed, but that is not tranquillity. That is why one must also understand the problem in this question of the person who controls, and that which is controlled. Surely, they are not separate phenomena, but a joint phenomenon: the controller and the controlled are one. It is a deception to think that they are two different processes; but we will discuss this at another time.

* * *

Question: How on earth can we tame the tiger in us, and in our children, without a pattern of clear purpose and cause, sustained by vigorous practice?

KRISHNAMURTI: This implies that you know your purpose, and you know the cause too; doesn't it? Do you know the purpose? Do you know the purpose of life, the end of life, and the way to achieve it? Is that why you must have a vigorous course of action through discipline, through practice, to attain what you want? Isn't it very difficult to find out what you want, the purpose you have in view? Political parties may have a purpose, but even then they are finding it extremely difficult. But can you say, "I know the purpose"? And is there such a thing as a purpose? Please, one has to go into this very carefully—not that I am casting doubt on your purposes. We must understand it. At a certain period of our life we have a purpose: to be an engine driver, to be a street-car driver, to be a fireman, this or that; and later on we come to have a different purpose. As we grow much older again we have a different purpose. The purpose varies all the

time doesn't it?, according to our pains and pleasures. You may have a purpose to be a very rich man, a very powerful man; but surely, that is not what we are discussing here for the time being. The ambitious man may have a purpose, but he is anti-social; he can never find reality. An ambitious man is merely one who is projecting himself into the future and wanting to be something, spiritually or secularly. Such a man, obviously, is not capable of finding reality, because his mind is only concerned with success, with achieving, with becoming something. He is concerned about himself in relation to what he wants. But most of us, though we are somewhat ambitious—wanting a little more money, a little more friendship, a little more love, a little more beauty, a little more this and that, and so on, many things—, do we know what we want ultimately, not just through passing moods? Most religious people say yes, they do; they want reality, they want God, they want the highest. But to desire the highest, you must know what it is; it may be quite different from what you think, and probably it is. Therefore; you cannot want that. If you want it, it is another form of ambition, another form of security. Therefore, it is not reality that you want. So, when you ask, "How can we tame the tiger in us and in our children, without a pattern of clear purpose and cause, sustained by practice?", you mean, do you not?, how can we live in relationship with others and not be anti-social, selfish, bound by our own prejudices, and so on. To tame the tiger, we must first know what kind of an animal it is, not just give it a name and try to tame it. You must know what it is made up of. So, if you call it a tiger, it is already a tiger, because you have the image, the picture of what the tiger is, or what greed is; but if you do not name it, but look at it, then surely, it has quite a different significance. I don't know if you are following all this.

We will discuss the same problem at various times, because there is only one problem put in different ways.

So, without calling it a tiger, without saying, "I have a purpose, and to fulfill it there must be discipline", let us inquire into the whole process. Don't approach it with a conclusion; because, as I said, the problem is always new, and it requires a new mind to look at it, a mind that is not verbalizing, which is extremely difficult. Because we can only think in terms of words; our thought is word. Try to think without words, and see how difficult it is.

So, our point is, how to tame the tiger without discipline, whether in ourselves or in our children, if we are parents. To tame something, you must understand it, know it. The moment you do not know something, you are frightened of it. You say, "I feel there is a conflict in me, an opposing desire, which I call the tiger; and how is that to be tamed, to be calmed down?" Only by understanding it; and I can understand it only when I look at it. I cannot look at it if I condemn it, or give it a name, or justify it, or identify myself with it. I can understand it only when I am passively aware of what it is; and there is no passive awareness as long as I am condemning it. So, my problem is to understand it, not to call the thing by a name. I must understand why I condemn. Because it is so much easier, isn't it?, to condemn something first. It is one of the ways to get rid of it, push it away—call it a German, a Japanese, a Hindu, a Christian, a Communist, or God knows what else, and push it away. And we think we have understood it by giving it a name. So the name, the naming, prevents understanding. That is one fact.

Also, what prevents understanding, is judging; because we look at a thing already with a bias, with a prejudice, with a want, with a demand. We look at a thing because we want a result from it. We have a purpose,

we want to tame it, we want to control it in order that it may be something else. The moment you see that, surely, your mind is passively quiet, watching the thing. It is no longer naming the tiger as the tiger; it has no name, and therefore your relationship to it is direct, not through words. It is because we have no relationship to it directly, that there is fear. The moment you are related to something, experience something directly, immediately, fully, there is no fear, is there? So, you have removed the cause of fear, and therefore you are able to understand it, and hence you are able to resolve it. That which you have understood, is resolved; that which is not understood, continues to be a problem. This is a fact. And our difficulty is to see always what is, without interpretation; because the function of the mind is to communicate, to store up, to translate, according to its fancies and desires—not to understand. To understand, none of these things must take place. To understand, there must be quiet; and a mind that is occupied with judging, with condemning, with translating, is not a quiet mind.

Question : I cannot control my thoughts. Must I control them? Does this not imply choice, and how can I trust my judgment, unless I have a standard based on the teachings of the Great Ones?

KRISHNAMURTI: Now, to understand how to control your thoughts, you must first know what your thoughts are, must you not? That is the problem, isn't it? You say, "I cannot control my thoughts." To find out why you cannot control thoughts, you must be aware of what thinking is, must you not? What is thinking? And who is the thinker? Surely, that is the question, isn't it? Who is the thinker, and are the thoughts different from the thinker? Then the problem arises for the

thinker to control his thoughts. If the thinker and the thought are one, and not separate processes, then the question of the thinker controlling thought does not arise. So, you have to find out first, if the thinker is separate from his thought. Is there a thinker without thought? If you have no thought, is there a thinker? So, the thinker is non-existent apart from thought; we have only thought. The thoughts have created the thinker; and the thinker, to make himself permanent, secure, and all the rest of it, then says, "I am apart from the thoughts which must be controlled." So, until you solve this problem, until you have a direct experience of this problem—whether the thinker is separate from thought—the question of control will exist, but the moment you see, experience directly, that the thinker is the thought, then you have quite a different problem.

Then, the next question is: When you control thoughts, one set of thoughts as opposed to another, there is choice. You choose certain thoughts and wish to concentrate on those, and not on others; why? We are concerned with thinking, not with a particular set of thoughts. If you say, "I prefer this thought to that," then choice arises; but why do you prefer? And what is the thing that prefers? Sirs, this is not very complicated, this is not metaphysics or big words; just look at it, and you will see the difficulty. First, we must see the difficulty, before we can solve it. When you choose, who is it that chooses? And, if the chooser has a standard according to the teachings of the Great Ones, as stated in the question, then the chooser becomes very important, doesn't he? Because, if he chooses according to the standards of the Teachers, then he is cultivating, emphasizing the chooser, is he not?

Sir, let us put the problem a little more simply. My thoughts wander all over the place. I want to think quietly upon a particular subject, but

my thoughts go off in different directions. Now, why do they go off? Because my thoughts are also interested in other things, not only in that particular thing. That is a fact, isn't it? otherwise they would not wander off. My mind isn't wandering off now, because I am interested in what I am talking about. There is no question of effort, there is no question of discipline, there is no question of controlling, nothing else interests me.

So, we must find out the significance of each interest, and not exclude other interests for the sake of one. If I can find out the significance of each interest, and its value, then my mind won't wander, will it? But it will wander if I resist the various interests and try to concentrate on the one. So, I say, "All right, let it wander." I look at all the interests that arise, one after the other, so that my mind is made pliable by the whole sweep of interest, and not narrowed down by one specific interest. Then what happens? I see that my mind is merely a bundle of interests, opposing other interests; it chooses to emphasize one interest, and exclude all other interests.

When the mind recognizes that it is a bundle of interests, then every interest has significance; therefore, there is no excluding; therefore, there is no question of choosing; therefore, the mind begins to understand the whole, total process of itself. But if you have a standard of choice in accordance with the Great Ones, by which you are trying to live—then what happens? You emphasize the thinker, the chooser, don't you? Obviously. Now, who is the chooser, apart from the choice? As I said, there is no thinker apart from the thought; and it is a trick of the mind to separate itself into the thinker and the thought. When we really understand it, see the real significance of it, experience it,—not verbally assert it, for then it has no meaning,—then we will see that there is complete transformation in us. Then, we

will never put this question. The standard of the Great Teachers, the teachings of the Great Ones, or whatever else—you are the result of all that, aren't you? You are the result of the whole, total process of man—not just of America but of the world. And you are not separate from the standard. You are the standard, and it is a trick of the mind ever to separate itself.

Because you see that everything is transient, impermanent, you want to feel that at least there is the permanency of the *me*. You say, "I am different." In that separate action of the mind, there is conflict; it creates for itself an isolation, and then says, "I am different from my thought. I must control my thought. How am I to control it?" Such a question is not a valid question. If you think it out, you will see that you are a bundle of interests, a bundle of thoughts; and to choose one thought and discard the others, to choose one interest and resist another, is still to play the trick of separating yourself from the thought. Whereas, if you recognize that the mind is interest, the mind is thought—that there is not a thinker and a thought—, then you will approach this problem entirely anew. Then you will see that there is no conflict between the thinker and the thought; then every interest has significance and is worked out, thought out, fully, completely. Then there is no question of a central interest from which there is distraction.

July 30, 1949

VI

This morning I would like to discuss what is true religion, but in order to find out what it is, we must first examine our life, and not superimpose on it something we think is spiritual, romantic, sentimental. So, let us examine our life to find out what we mean by religion, and

if there is a way of discovering what is true religion.

First of all, for most of us, life is full of conflict; we are in pain, we are in sorrow. Our life is boring, empty; and there is always death, and there are the innumerable explanations. Life is mostly a constant repetition of habit. Taken as a whole, it is painful and tiresome, wearisome and sorrowful, and that is the lot of most of us. To escape from that, we turn to beliefs, to rituals, to knowledge, to amusements, to politics, to activity: we welcome any form of escape from our daily, tiresome, boring routine. These escapes, whether political or religious, must, by their very nature, likewise become tiresome, routine, habitual. We move from sensation to sensation; and ultimately, all sensation must become boring, tiresome. As our life is mostly a response from our physical centers, and as it causes disturbance, pain, we try to escape into what we call religion, into spiritual realms.

Now, as long as we are seeking sensation in any form, it must eventually lead to boredom; because one is surfeited, one gets tired of it—which is, again, an obvious fact. The more sensations you have, the more tiresome they become at the end, the more boring, the more habitual. And is religion a matter of sensation?—religion being the search for reality, and the discovery, the understanding, or the experiencing of the highest. Is that a matter of sensation, a matter of sentiment, a matter of appeal? To most of us, religion is a set of beliefs, dogmas, rituals, a constant repetition of organized formulae, and so on. If you examine these things you will see that they also are the outcome of the desire for sensation. You go to churches, temples, or to mosques, and you repeat certain phrases, you indulge in certain ceremonies. They are all stimulations, they give you a certain kind of sensation; and you are satisfied with that sensation, giving it a high-

sounding name, but it is essentially sensation. You are caught in sensation, you like the impressions, the feeling of being good, the repetition of certain prayers, and so on. But, if one goes into it deeply and intelligently, one finds that basically they are only sensation; and although they may vary in expression and give you a feeling of newness, they are essentially sensation, and therefore ultimately boring, tiresome, habit-forming.

So, obviously, religion is not ceremony. Religion is not dogma. Religion is not the continuation of certain tenets or beliefs, inculcated from childhood. Whether you believe in God, or don't believe in God, does not make you a religious person. Belief does not make you a religious person, surely. The man who drops an atomic bomb and destroys in a few minutes thousands upon thousands of people, may believe in God, and the person who leads a dull life and also believes in God, or the person who does not believe in God,—surely, they are not religious. Belief or non-belief has nothing to do with the search for reality, or with the discovery and the experiencing of that reality, which is religion. It is the experiencing of reality that is religion; and it does not lie through any organized belief, through any church, through any knowledge, either eastern or western. Religion is the capacity of experiencing directly that which is immeasurable, that which cannot be put into words; but that cannot be experienced, so long as we are escaping from life, from life which we have made so dull, so empty, so much a matter of routine. Life, which is relationship, has become a matter of routine, because inwardly there is no creative intensity, because inwardly we are poor, and therefore outwardly we try to fill that emptiness with belief, with amusement, with knowledge, with various forms of excitement.

That emptiness, that inward poverty, can come to an end only when

we cease to escape; and we cease to escape when we are no longer seeking sensation. Then we are able to face that emptiness. That emptiness is not different from us: we are that emptiness. As we were discussing yesterday, thought is not different from the thinker. The emptiness is not different from the observer who feels that emptiness. The observer and the observed are a joint phenomenon; and when you experience that directly, then you will find that the thing which you have dreaded as emptiness—which makes you seek escape into various forms of sensation, including religion—ceases, and you are able to face it and be it. Because we have not understood the significance of escapes, how escapes have come into being; because we have not examined them, gone into them fully, these escapes have become much more significant, much more meaningful, than that which is. The escapes have conditioned us; and because we have escaped, we are not creative in ourselves. There is creativeness in us when we are experiencing reality constantly, but not continuously—because there is a difference between continuity, and experiencing from moment to moment. That which continues, decays. That which is being experienced from moment to moment, has no death, no decay. If we can experience something from moment to moment, it has a vitality, life; if we can meet life anew all the time, then in that there is creativeness. But to have an experience which you desire to continue—in that there is decay.

So many people have had some kind of pleasurable experience, and they want that experience to continue. So they go back to it, they revive it, they look to it, they long for it, they are miserable because it doesn't continue; and therefore there is a constant decaying process taking place. Whereas, if there is experiencing from moment to moment, there is a renewal. It is that renewal that is creative; and you cannot have

that renewal, that creative *elan*, if your mind is occupied with escapes and caught in those things that we have taken for granted. That is why we have to re-examine all of the values that we have gathered; and one of the main values in our life is religion, which is so organized. We belong to one or other of the various organized religions, groups, sects, or societies, because it gives us a certain sense of security. To be identified with the largest organization, or with the smallest, or the most exclusive, gives us satisfaction. It is only when we are capable of re-examining all these influences which are conditioning us, which help us to escape from our own boredom, from our own emptiness, from our own lack of creative responsibility and creative joy; it is only when we have examined them and come back, having put them aside and faced that which is—only then, surely, are we capable of really going into the whole problem of what is truth. Because, in doing that, there is a possibility of self-knowledge. The whole process is self-knowledge; and it is only when there is the knowledge of this process that there is a possibility of thinking, feeling, acting rightly. We cannot practise right thinking in order to be free from the process of thought; to be free, one must know oneself. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom; and without self-knowledge, there can be no wisdom. There can be knowledge, sensation; but sensation is wearisome, boring, whereas that wisdom which is eternal can never decay, can never come to an end.

becoming smug, do you think he can be right? (Laughter).

KRISHNAMURTI: Now, let us first understand what we mean by effort, and what we mean by concentration. Do we understand anything through effort?—effort being exertion of will, action of will, which is desire. By the action of will to understand, that is, by deliberately making an effort, do we understand? Or is understanding something entirely different, which comes, not through effort, but through passive alertness?—which is not the action of will. When do you understand? Have you ever examined it? When do you understand? Not when you are battling with something, with some object which you want to understand. Surely, there is no understanding when you are constantly probing, questioning, tearing to pieces, analyzing—in that there is no understanding. It is only when the mind is passively aware and alert, that is, immediately in contact with or experiencing that thing, that there is a possibility of understanding it, surely. Please, to some of you what I am saying may be outrageous, or new; but experiment with it, don't reject it right off.

When we are in battle with each other, in conflict with each other, is there an understanding? It is only when you and I sit down quietly, discuss, try to find out, that there is a possibility of understanding. So, effort is obviously detrimental to understanding. That is, you may have a problem, you may go into it, worry over it, tear it to pieces, look at it from different sides. In that process, there is no understanding. It is only when the mind leaves the problem alone, lets it drop, only when the mind becomes quiet in relation to the problem, that there is understanding of it. But whether conflict, analysis, is a necessary step in understanding, is quite a different question, which we won't go into now.

Question: I find that, by effort, I can concentrate. I can suppress or put aside thoughts that come uninvited. I do not find that suppression is a hindrance to my well-being. Of course, I dream; but I can interpret the dreams and resolve the conflict. A friend tells me that I am

Then there is concentration. What do you mean by concentration? Fixing the mind on a particular object to the exclusion of other interests, isn't it? That is what we mean by concentration: to fix the mind on an idea, an image, an interest, and exclude all other interests—which is a form of suppression. And the questioner says that it does not do him any harm; though he has dreams, he can easily interpret and put them aside.

Now, what does such concentration do? What does exclusion do? What is the result of exclusion? Obviously, conflict, isn't it? I may have the capacity to concentrate on one thing and exclude others; but the others are still there, wanting to come in. Therefore, there is a conflict going on—whether I am conscious of it or not, is not the point; but there is conflict. And, as long as that conflict continues, there is no understanding, surely. I may be able to concentrate; but as long as there is conflict within me between that which attracts my attention, and that which I am excluding—as long as there is conflict in me, it must have a wrong effect. Because, suppression of any kind must psychologically tear, making me either physically ill, or mentally unbalanced. What is suppressed must eventually come out, and one way is through dreams. The questioner says he can interpret his dreams and thereby get rid of them. Apparently he feels satisfied with this, and he wants to know if he is smug. As long as you are satisfied with the result, obviously you must be smug. Most of us hate to be in discontent; and being discontented inwardly, as most of us are, we find ways and means to cover up that discontent, that burning thing. And one of the escapes, one of the best ways of covering up this discontent, is to learn concentration, so that you can successfully conceal your discontent. Then you can fix your mind on an interest and go after it, and feel that you have at last conquered, canalized

your discontent. But, surely, discontent cannot be canalized by the mind, because the mind in its very nature is discontent. That is why mere concentration, which is exclusion, does not bring about freedom from discontent—which is to understand it. Concentration, which is a process of exclusion, does not bring understanding; but, as I was explaining yesterday, if you go after each interest as each interest arises, if you go into it, examine it, understand it—then there is a possibility of coming to a different kind of attention which is not exclusion. We will discuss this presently, in another question.

Question: How can we ever start anew, as you constantly suggest, if the cup of our experience is permanently sullied? How can we really forget that which we are? Will you please explain what is meant by self-forgetfulness. How can I throw away the cup, which I am?

KRISHNAMURTI: Renewal is possible only if there is no continuity. That which continues has no possibility of renewal; that which ends has a possibility of renewal. That which dies has a possibility of being reborn. And, when you say that you are sullied permanently, which is but a verbal assertion, then, surely, you are merely continuing. When you say you are permanently sullied, is that a fact? And, how is it possible to forget what we are? We cannot forget what we are; but we can examine what we are, we can be aware, without any justification or identification, of what we are. Be aware of it, and you will see there comes a transformation. But the difficulty is to be passively aware, without condemnation; only then is there an ending. But if you merely identify, condemn, then you give continuity to that particular character; and that which continues has no reality, has no renewal.

"Will you please explain what is meant by self-forgetfulness?" Don't you know? Don't you know those moments when one is happy, when one is peaceful, when one is very quiet? Does not a state come into being in which no effort is involved, in which there is a cessation of the thought process as myself? As long as there is self-consciousness as the me, there can be no forgetfulness of the activities of the me. Any action of the will, of desire, obviously must cultivate and strengthen the self; and the self is the bundle of memories, characteristics, idiosyncrasies, which creates conflict. As long as there is conflict, there must be self-consciousness; and if there is conflict, there can never be peace, however deeply concealed, at whatever level that conflict may be.

"How can I throw away the cup, which I am?" Why do you want to throw away the cup? You cannot, surely, throw it away. All that you can do is to know it—all the intricacies, the subtleties, the extraordinary depth of oneself. When you know something, you are free of it; but merely to reject it, to suppress it, to sublimate it, to translate it into different verbal expressions, is surely not understanding; and only in understanding something, is there freedom from it. You cannot understand something if there is continued identity with it. So there is renewal only when there is no continuity. But most of our intentions, purposes, thoughts, are to continue. In name, in property, in virtue, in everything we are struggling to establish a permanency, and therefore a continuity; and in that there is no renewal, there is no creativeness. Surely, creativeness comes into being only from moment to moment.

Question: Will you please carefully explain what is true meditation. There are so many systems of meditation. Are they really varied basically, or are the variations due to the

personal idiosyncrasies of their proponents?

KRISHNAMURTI: This is really an important question, and if I may suggest, let us go into it together. Because, meditation has a great deal of significance. It may be the door to real self-knowledge, and it may open the door to reality; and in opening the door and experiencing directly, there is a possibility of understanding life, which is relationship. Meditation, the right kind of meditation is essential. So, let us find out what is the right kind of meditation; and to find out what is right, we must approach it negatively. Merely to say this or that is right meditation, will give you only a pattern, which you will adopt, practise; and that will not be right meditation. So, as I am talking about it, please follow me closely and experience it as we go along together. Because, there are different types of meditation. I do not know if any of you have practised them, or have indulged in them—gone away by yourself in a locked room, sat in a dark corner, and so on and so on. So, let us examine the whole process of what we call meditation.

First of all, let us take the meditation in which discipline is involved. Any form of discipline only strengthens the self; and, the self is a source of contention, conflict. That is, if we discipline ourselves to be something, as so many people do—"this month I am going to be kind, I am going to practise kindness, and so on,"—such discipline, such practice, is bound to strengthen the me. You may be outwardly kind; but, surely, a man who practises kindness and is conscious of his kindness, is not kind. So, that practice, which people also call meditation, is obviously not the right kind; because, as we discussed yesterday, if you practise something, in that the mind is caught, and so there is no freedom. But, most of

us desire a result—that is, we hope to be kind at the end of the month, or at the end of a certain period, because teachers have said that ultimately we must be kind in order to find God. Since our desire is to find God as the ultimate source of our security and happiness, we buy God through kindness—which is obviously the strengthening of the me and the mine, a self-enclosing process; and anything that encloses, any action that is binding, can never give freedom. Surely, that is obvious. Perhaps we can discuss it another time if it is not clear.

Then, there is this whole process of concentration, which is also called meditation. You sit crossed-legged, because that is the fashion from India, or in a chair, in a dark room, in front of a picture or an image, and you try to concentrate on a word, on a phrase, or a mental image, and exclude all other thoughts. I am sure many of you have done this. But the other thoughts keep pouring in, and you push them out; and you keep on with the struggle till you are able to concentrate on one thought to the exclusion of everything else. Then you feel gratified: at last you have learned to fix your mind on a point, which you think is essential. Again, through exclusion, do you find anything? Through exclusion, suppression, denial, can the mind be quiet? Because, as I said, there can be understanding only when the mind is really quiet, not suppressed, not so concentrated on one idea that it becomes exclusive—whether the idea is of a Master, or of some virtue, or what you will. Through concentration, the mind can never be quiet. Superficially, at the higher levels of consciousness, you may enforce stillness, make your body perfectly still, your mind very quiet; but that, surely, is not the quietness of your whole being. So, again, that is not meditation; that is merely compulsion: when the engine wants to run at full speed, you hold it back, you put on the brake. Whereas, if you

are able to examine every interest, every thought that comes into your mind, go into it fully, completely, think every thought out—then there will be no wandering of the mind, because the mind has found the value of each thought, therefore it is no longer attracted, which means there is no distraction. A mind that is capable of being distracted, and which resists distraction, is not capable of meditation. Because, what is distraction? I hope you are experimenting with what I am saying, experiencing as I am talking, to find out the truth of this matter. It is the truth that liberates, not my words or your opinions.

We call distraction any movement away from that in which we think we should be interested. So you choose a particular interest, a so-called noble interest, and fix your mind on it; but any movement away from it, is a distraction, so you resist distraction. But why do you choose that one particular interest? Obviously, because it is gratifying, because it gives you a sense of security, a sense of fullness, a sense of otherness. So you say, 'I must fix my mind on that', and any movement away from it, is a distraction. You spend your life in battle against distractions, and fix your mind on something else. Whereas, if you examine every distraction, and not merely fix your mind on a particular attraction, then you will see that the mind is no longer capable of being distracted, because it has understood the distractions as well as the attractions, and therefore the mind is capable of extraordinary, extensive awareness without exclusion.

So, concentration is not meditation, and disciplining is not meditation.

Then, there are prayers, this whole problem of praying and receiving. That also is called meditation. What do we mean by praying? The gross form is supplication, and there are subtle forms at different levels of prayer. The gross form we all know. I am in trouble, I am in misery, physi-

eally or psychologically, and I want some help. So I beg, I supplicate; and, obviously, there is an answer. If there were no answer, people would not pray. Millions pray. You pray only when you are in trouble, not when you are happy, not when there is that extraordinary sense of otherness.

Now, what happens when you pray? You have a formula, haven't you? By repetition of a formula, the superficial mind becomes quiet, doesn't it? Try it, and you will see. By repeating certain phrases or words, gradually you will see your being becomes quiet. That is, your superficial consciousness is calm; and then, in that state, you are able to receive, aren't you?, the intimations of something else. So, through calming the mind by a repetitive word, by so-called prayers, you may receive hints and intimations not only from the sub-conscious, but from anything around you; but, surely, that is not meditation. Because, what you receive must be gratifying, otherwise you would reject it. So when you pray and thereby quiet the mind, your desire is to solve a particular problem, or a confusion, or something which gives you pain. Therefore, you are seeking an answer which will be gratifying. And when you see this, you say, 'I must not seek gratification, I will be open to something which is painful'. The mind is so capable of playing tricks upon itself, that one must be aware of the whole content of this question of prayer. One has learned a trick, how to quiet the mind so that it can receive certain answers, pleasurable or not pleasurable. But that is not meditation, is it?

Then, there is this question of devotion to somebody, pouring out your love to God, to an image, to some saint, to some Master. Is that meditation? Why do you pour out your love to God, to that which you cannot possibly know? Why are we so attracted to the unknown, and give our lives, our being, to it? This

whole question of devotion, does it not indicate that, being miserable in our own lives, having no vital relationship with other human beings, we try to project ourselves into something, into the unknown, and worship the unknown? You know, people who are devoted to somebody, to some God, to some image, to some Master, are generally cruel, obstinate. They are intolerant of others, they are willing to destroy others, because they have so identified themselves with that image, with that Master, with that experience. So, again, the outpouring of devotion to an object, self-created or created by another, is surely not meditation.

So, what is meditation? If none of these things are meditation—discipline, concentration, prayer, devotion—, then what is meditation? Those are the forms we know, with which we are familiar. But, to find out that, with which we are not familiar, we have first to be free of those things with which we are familiar, haven't we? If they are not true, then they must be set aside. Then only, are you capable of finding out what is right meditation. If we have been accustomed to false values, those false values must cease, must they not?, to find out the new value—not because I say so, but because you think it out, feel it out for yourself. And when they have gone, what have you left? What is the residue of your examination of these things? Do they not reveal the process of your own thinking? If you have indulged in these things, and you see that they are false, you find out why you have indulged in them; and therefore, the very examination of all this reveals the way of your own thinking. So, the examination of these things is the beginning of self-knowledge, is it not?

So, meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge, you may sit in a corner, meditate on the Masters, develop virtues—they are all illusions, and they have no meaning for the person who really

wants to discover what is right meditation. Because, without self-knowledge, you yourself project an image which you call the Master, and that becomes your object of devotion for which you are willing to sacrifice, to build, to destroy. Therefore, as I have explained, there is a possibility of self-knowledge, only as we examine our relationship to these things, which reveals the process of our own thinking; and therefore there is a clarity in our whole being; and this is the beginning of understanding, of self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge, there can be no meditation; and without meditation, there can be no self-knowledge. Shutting yourself up in a corner, sitting in front of a picture, developing virtues month by month—a different virtue each month, green, purple, white, and all the rest of it—going to churches, performing ceremonies: none of those things are meditation, or real spiritual life. Spiritual life arises in the understanding of relationship, which is the beginning of self-knowledge.

Now, when you have gone through that and have abandoned all those processes, which only reveal the self and its activity, then there is a possibility that the mind can be not only superficially quiet, but inwardly quiet; for then there is a cessation of all demands. There is no pursuit of sensation; there is no sense of becoming, myself becoming something, in the future, or tomorrow. The Master, the initiate, the pupil, the Buddha, you know, climbing the ladder of success, becoming something—all that has stopped, because all that implies the process of becoming. There is a cessation of becoming only when there is the understanding of what is; and the understanding of what is, comes through self-knowledge, which reveals exactly what one is. And when there is the cessation of all desire, which can only come through self-knowledge, the mind is quiet.

The cessation of desire cannot come through compulsion, through prayer, through devotion, through concentration. All these merely emphasize the conflict of desire in the opposites. But when there is the cessation of all these, then the mind is really still—not only superficially, on the higher levels, but inwardly, deeply. Then only, is it possible for it to receive that which is immeasurable. The understanding of all this is meditation, not just one part of it. Because, if we do not know how to meditate, we will not know how to act. Action, after all, is self-knowledge, in relationship; and merely to shut yourself in a sacred room with incense burning, reading about other people's meditations and their significance is utterly useless, it has no meaning. It is a marvellous escape. But to be aware of all this human activity, which is ourselves—the desire to attain, the desire to conquer, the desire to have certain virtues, all emphasizing the me as important in the now or in the future, this becoming of the me—to be aware of all that, in its totality, is the beginning of self-knowledge and the beginning of meditation. Then you will see, if you are really aware, that there comes a marvelous transformation, which is not a verbal expression, which is not verbalization, mere repetition, sensation. But actually, really, vigorously, there takes place a thing which cannot be named, which cannot be termed. And that is not the gift of the few, it is not the gift of the Masters: self-knowledge is possible for everybody, if you are willing to experiment, try. You don't have to join any society, read any book, or be at the feet of any Master; for self-knowledge liberates you from all that absurdity, the stupidities of human invention. And then only, through self-knowledge and right meditation, there is freedom. In that freedom there comes reality; but you cannot have reality through mental processes. It must come to you; and it can only come

to you when there is freedom from desire.

July 31, 1949

VII

For the last three week-ends, we have been discussing, in different days, the problem of self-knowledge and how it is necessary to understand the process of our own thinking and feeling. Without understanding oneself clearly and definitely, it is not possible to think rightly. But, unfortunately, it seems to have left an impression among many, or at least among those who are committed to a particular form of prejudice which they call thinking, that this approach is individualistic and utterly selfish and self-centered, and does not lead to reality; that there are many paths to reality, and that this particular approach of self-knowledge must invariably lead to inaction, to self-centeredness and individual ruggedness.

Now, if you go into it very clearly and thoroughly, with intelligence, you see that to truth there can be no path; there is no path, as yours and mine: the path of service, the path of knowledge, the path of devotion, and the other innumerable paths that philosophers have invented, depending on their particular idiosyncrasies and neurological responses. Now, if one can think clearly about this matter, without prejudice—I mean by prejudice, being committed to a particular action of thought or belief, and being utterly unaware that one particular form of thinking, one particular approach, must inevitably limit, whether it is the path of knowledge, the path of devotion, or the path of action—, one will see that any particular path must invariably limit, and therefore cannot lead to reality. Because, a path of action, or a path of knowledge, or a

path of devotion, in itself, is not sufficient, surely. A man of learning, however erudite, however encyclopaedic his knowledge may be, if he has no love, surely his knowledge is worthless; it is merely book-learning. A man of belief, as we discussed, must inevitably shape his life according to the dogma, the tenet, that he holds, and therefore his experience must be limited; because, one experiences according to one's beliefs, and such experience can never be liberating. On the contrary, it is binding. And, as we said, only in freedom can we discover anything new, anything fundamental.

So, the difficulty with the majority of us is, it seems to me, that we are committed to so many beliefs, dogmas, that they prevent us from looking afresh at anything new; and therefore—as reality, God, or what you will, must be something unimaginable, something immeasurable—the mind cannot possibly understand. Do what it will, it cannot go beyond itself. It can create reality in its own image; but it will not be reality. It will be only its own self-projection. And, therefore, to understand reality, or for that immensity to come into being, one must understand the process of one's own thinking. That is, surely, the obvious approach. It is not my approach or your approach: it is the only intelligent approach. And intelligence is not yours or mine: it is quite beyond all countries and all paths, beyond all religious, social, or political activity. It does not belong to any particular society or group. Intelligence comes into being only with the understanding of oneself—which does not mean, surely, emphasis on the individual. On the contrary. It is the insistence on a path or a belief, on any ideology, that emphasizes the individual, though that individual may belong to a large group, be identified with a large group. Mere identification with the collective does not mean that one is free from the limited individuality.

So, it is important, surely, to understand, that reality or God or what you will, is not to be found through any particular path. The Hindus have very cleverly divided human beings into various types, and established paths for them. And, surely, any path—which is the emphasis of individuality, and not the freedom from individuality—cannot lead to reality, because it cultivates a particularity; it is not the freedom from selfishness, from prejudice, which is so essential to understanding. Therefore, we have been discussing for the last three weeks, the importance of self-knowledge—which is not emphasis on individuality, on the personal, at all. If I do not know myself, I have no basis for thinking, whatever I think is merely an imposition, an external acceptance of various influences, circumstantial enforcement. Surely, that is not thinking. Because I have been brought up in a particular society, of the left or of the right, and have accepted a certain ideology from childhood, it does not mean that I am capable of thinking of life anew. I merely function in that particular pattern, and reject anything else that is given to me. Whereas, to think rightly, truly, profoundly, one has to begin by questioning the whole environmental process, and the influence of the environment from the outside, of which I am a part. Without understanding that process, in all its subtlety, surely I have no basis for thinking.

So, it is absolutely essential, is it not?, that the process of the mind be thoroughly understood—not only the conscious, the upper level, the superficial level of the mind, but the deeper levels of the mind. Because, it is comparatively easy to understand the superficial mind; to watch its reactions, its responses, to see how instinctively it acts and thinks. But that is only the beginning, is it not? It is much more difficult to go more profoundly, more deeply, into the whole process of our thinking; and,

without knowing the whole process, the total process, then what you believe, what you don't believe, what you think, whether you believe in Masters or don't believe in Masters, whether you believe in God or don't—all that is really irrelevant, is almost immature.

Now, it is comparatively easy, in listening to another, to see in that relationship a mirror in which we discover ourselves; but our problem is also to go into it much more profoundly, and that is where our difficulty lies. Perhaps a few of us can throw off our superficial prejudices, beliefs, give up a few societies and join new organizations—the many things that one does; but surely it is much more important; isn't it?, to go below, to the deeper layers of consciousness, and find out exactly what is taking place: what are our commitments of which we are so unconscious, our beliefs, our fears of which we are utterly unaware, but which actually guide and shape our action. Because, the inner always overcomes the outer. You may cunningly sift the outer, but the inner eventually breaks down the outer. In any Utopian society, you may build a social order very carefully and very cunningly; but without this psychological understanding of man's whole make-up, the outer is always smashed.

How is it possible, then, to go into the deeper layers of consciousness? Because, that is where most of our idiosyncrasies, most of our fears that create beliefs, most of our desires, ambitions, lie hidden. How is it possible to open them up, to expose and understand them? If we can have the capacity to delve into that and really experience these things, not merely verbally, then it is possible to be free of them, isn't it?

Take, for example, anger. Is it possible to experience anger and be aware of anger without giving it a name? I do not know if you have ever tried, if you have ever experienced a state which is not named.

If we have an experience, we give it a term, and we term it in order to explore it, or to communicate it, or to strengthen it. But we never experience a thing without naming it. That is extremely difficult, isn't it?, for most of us. Verbalization comes almost before experience. But if we do not name an experience, then perhaps it is possible to go into the deeper layers of consciousness. And that is why we must be aware, even at the superficial level, of our prejudices, fears, ambitions; of our fixations in a particular groove, whether we are young or old, whether of the left or of the right. Therefore, there must be a certain discontent—which is obviously often denied to the older, because they don't want to be discontented. They are fixed, they are going to disappear slowly; therefore they establish, crystallize in a particular groove, and deny everything new. But, surely, discontent is necessary—not the discontent that is easily canalized into a particular groove, a particular action, a particular belief, but discontent that is never satisfied. Because, most of our discontent arises from dissatisfaction. The moment we have found satisfaction, dissatisfaction ceases, discontent comes to an end. So most of our discontent is really a search for satisfaction. Whereas, discontent, surely, is a state in which there is no search for satisfaction. The moment I am easily satisfied, the problem is over. If I accept the left ideology, or the right, or some particular belief, my dissatisfaction is easily gratified. But discontent is of another quality, surely. Contentment is that state in which what is, is understood. To understand what is, there must be no prejudice. To see things as they are, requires enormous alertness of mind. But if we are easily satisfied, that alertness is dulled, made blunt.

So, our problem is, in all this—which is a question of relationship—to be aware of ourselves in action, in what we are thinking, in what we are saying; so that, in relationship,

we discover ourselves, we see ourselves as we are. But to superimpose our beliefs on what we are, surely does not help to bring about understanding of what we are. Therefore, it is necessary to be free of this imposition—political, sociological, or religious—, which can only be revealed in relationship. And as long as that relationship is not understood, there must be conflict, between two or between many. For the ending of that conflict, there must be self-knowledge; and when the mind is quiet—not made quiet—, then only is it possible to understand reality.

Many questions have been given to me, and naturally they cannot all be answered; but I will try to answer as many representative questions as possible, though sometimes the questions may be put in different words, with a change of terms. So, I hope you will not mind.

Question : If I am perfectly honest, I have to admit that I resent, and at times, hate almost everybody. It makes my life very unhappy and painful. I understand intellectually that I am this resentment, this hatred; but I cannot cope with it. Can you show me a way ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Now, what do we mean by 'intellectually'? When we say that we understand something intellectually, what do we mean by that? Is there such a thing as intellectual understanding? Or is it that the mind merely understands the words, because that is our only way of communicating with each other? Do we understand anything verbally? That is the first thing we have to be clear about: whether so-called intellectual understanding is not an impediment to understanding. Surely, understanding is integral, not divided, not partial. Either I understand something, or I don't. To say to oneself, 'I understand something intellectually', is surely a barrier to

understanding. It is a partial process, and therefore, no understanding at all.

Now, the question is this: How am I, who am resentful, hateful, how am I to be free of, or cope with that problem? How do we cope with a problem? What is a problem? Surely, a problem is something which is disturbing.

Please, may I suggest something? Just follow what I am saying. Don't try to solve your problem of resentment and hate—just follow it. Although it is difficult to go into this so that at the end you are free of it, let us see if we can do it now. It will be rather an interesting experiment to try together.

I am resentful, I am hateful, I hate people, and it causes pain. And I am aware of it. What am I to do? It is a very disturbing factor in my life. What am I to do, how am I to be really free of it—not just momentarily slough it off, but fundamentally be free of it? How am I to do it?

Now, it is a problem to me because it disturbs me. If it were not a disturbing thing, it would not be a problem to me, would it? Because it causes pain, disturbance, anxiety, because I think it is ugly, I want to get rid of it. Therefore, the thing that I am objecting to is the disturbance, isn't it? I give it different names at different times, in different moods; I call it one day this, and one day something else. But the desire is, basically, not to be disturbed. Isn't that it? Because pleasure is not disturbing, I accept it. I don't want to be free from pleasure, because there is no disturbance—at least, for the time being. But hate, resentment, are very disturbing factors in my life, and I want to get rid of them.

So, my concern is not to be disturbed, and I am trying to find a way in which I shall never be disturbed. And why should I not be disturbed? I must be disturbed, to find out, must I not? I must go through tremendous upheavals,

turmoil, anxiety, to find out, must I not? Because, if I am not disturbed, I shall go to sleep; and perhaps that is what most of us do want—to be pacified, to be put to sleep, to get away from any disturbance, to find isolation, seclusion, security. So, if I do not mind being disturbed—really, not just superficially, if I don't mind being disturbed, because I want to find out—then my attitude toward hate, toward resentment, undergoes a change, doesn't it? If I do not mind being disturbed, then the name is not important, is it? The word 'hate' is not important, is it? Or 'resentment' against people is not important, is it? Because, then I am directly experiencing the state which I call resentment without verbalizing that experience. I do not know if I am explaining myself.

That is, anger is a very disturbing quality, as hate and resentment are: and very few of us experience anger directly, without verbalizing it. If we do not verbalize it, if we do not call it anger, surely there is a different experience, is there not? Because we term it, we reduce a new experience or fix it in the terms of the old. Whereas, if we do not name it, then there is an experience which is directly understood; and this understanding brings about a transformation in that experiencing. Am I making myself clear? Please, it is not simple.

Take, for example, meanness. Most of us, if we are mean, are unaware of it—mean about money matters, mean about forgiving people, you know, just being mean. I am sure we are familiar with that. Now, being aware of it, how are we going to be free from that quality?—not to become generous, that is not the important point. To be free from meanness implies generosity, you haven't got to become generous. So, obviously, one must be aware of it. You may be very generous in giving a large donation to your society, to your friends, but awfully mean about giving a bigger tip—you know what I mean

by 'mean'. One is unconscious of it. When one becomes aware of it, what happens? We exert our will to be generous; we try to overcome it; we discipline ourselves to be generous, and so on, and so on. But, after all, the exertion of will to be something is still part of meanness in a larger circle. So, if we do not do any of those things, but are merely aware of the implications of meanness, without giving it a term, then we will see that there takes place a radical transformation. Take anger: if you do not give it a term, but merely experience it—not through verbalization, because verbalization is a process of dulling the experience—but if you do not give it a term, then it is acute, it becomes very sharp, and it acts as a shock; and only then is it possible to be free.

Please experiment with this. First, one must be disturbed; and it is obvious that most of us do not like to be disturbed. We think we have found a pattern of life—the Master, the belief, whatever it is—and there we settle down. It is like having a good bureaucratic job, and functioning there for the rest of one's life. With that same mentality we approach various qualities of which we want to be rid. We do not see the importance of being disturbed, of being inwardly insecure, of not being dependent. Surely, it is only in insecurity that you discover, that you see, that you understand. We want to be like a man with plenty of money, at ease; but surely, he will not be disturbed; he doesn't want to be disturbed.

So, disturbance is essential for understanding; and any attempt to find security is a hindrance to understanding; and when we want to get rid of something which is disturbing, it is surely a hindrance. But if we can experience a feeling directly, without naming it, I think we will find a great deal in it; then there is no longer a battle with it, because the experiencer and the thing experienced are one; and that is essential. As

long as the experiencer verbalizes the feeling, the experience, he separates himself from it, and acts upon it; and such action is an artificial, illusory action. But if there is no verbalization, then the experiencer and the thing experienced are one. That integration is necessary and has to be radically faced. I hope this is clear. If not, we will discuss it at other meetings.

Question: I listened to you some years ago, and it did not mean much to me then; but listening to you now seems to mean a great deal. How is this?

KRISHNAMURTI: There are various explanations for this: that you have matured, that you have progressed, that life has knocked at your door, that you have suffered a great deal, and so on, and so on. That is, if what we are discussing means something to you. If you think it is all rot, then it is very simple. Now, people who believe in progress will give one kind of explanation: that you have slowly matured, that you must have time, not only a few years but another life, that time is essential for understanding; and that, though you have not understood at the beginning, you will understand later through gradual ripening of experience—you know, all the various theories one has. But surely, there is a much simpler way of looking at it, isn't there? For some unknown reason your friend, perhaps, brings you here, and you listen casually and go away; it doesn't mean much, except there are nice trees, you have had a nice drive, you know, and all the rest of it. And you go away. But, unconsciously, surely, you have taken something in. Haven't you noticed, when you are driving, or walking, though your conscious mind may be attending to the driving, or seeing a particular thing attentively, the other part of your mind is absorbing unconsciously. Something has taken place, a seed

has been sown, of which you are unconscious; but later it comes out. It is there. So what at the beginning may not have meant much—because you have listened to something of which you have not been conscious—later reacts on you.

Surely, that is the whole purpose of propaganda, isn't it? Not that I am a propagandist—I have a horror of propaganda. But that is what is happening in the world, isn't it?, with the newspapers, magazines, cinemas, the radio, and all the rest of it. You go on, really interested in what you are doing, and the radio or the newspaper is giving you propaganda. Your mind is elsewhere, but you are absorbing unconsciously; and later on, when that absorption is called forth, it comes out—like the automatic response to war, to nationalism, to the acceptance of certain beliefs, whether of the right or of the left. How do you think children are impregnated with certain ideas? It is the constant impingement of those ideas on the unconscious. And they accept; when they grow up, they are the same, either of the left or of the right, of this religion or that religion, with innumerable beliefs and conditioned minds. The unconscious has been absorbing all the time. And, it can absorb the ugly as well as the beautiful, the true as well as the false. And our difficulty is, is it not?, to be free of all these imprints, and to look at life anew. Is it possible to be free from the influence of these constant impacts? That is, to be aware of these impacts, and not to be influenced by them?. Because they are there. Can we be sensitive enough, alert enough, so that we know what is false, what is untrue: so that there is no resistance even? Because, the moment you resist, you strengthen what you are resisting, therefore you become part of it. But if you understand it, surely, then there is no longer its influence on the conscious or on the unconscious.

So, is it possible to be free from all the conditioning influences in

which we have been brought up? From nationalism, class differences, from the innumerable beliefs of religions and political ideologies? Surely, one must be free, otherwise one cannot find out what lies beyond freedom. But, to be free, one must examine all these things, must one not ?, and not accept a thing—which is not the cultivation of doubt. Therefore, for that very process one must understand the content of one's own consciousness, of what one is.

Question: Would you talk to us about sin?

KRISHNAMURTI: Every organized religion has unfortunately cultivated, for purposes of civilization, the feeling of guilt. Most of us have it—the more sensitive we are, the more acute the feeling. The more you feel responsible, the more guilty you feel. You see this world mess, the impending wars, and all the chicanery that is going on, and—being sensitive, being alert, being sufficiently interested and intelligent—you feel that you are responsible. And, as one can do so little, one feels guilty. That is one part of it. Then, in order to hold man within civilized limits, this sense of doing wrong has been very carefully, sedulously cultivated, has it not? Otherwise you would go over the border. Because, if we had no standards, if we had no sanctions, if we had no moral code—not that there is much now—it would be worse. So, religion, organized belief, has carefully maintained, cultivated this sense that you must toe the line, that you must not sin, that you must not commit ugly things. It has held us within a pattern; and it is only the very few that can go beyond the pattern, because we want to remain in the pattern. We want to be respectable—fear of public opinion, and so many things hold us to the pattern. And, being afraid, not depending on our own understanding, most of us rely on another: the priest, the psycholo-

gist, the leader, the politician, you know, the innumerable dependencies that one cultivates. All those naturally strengthen our inherent anxiety to do the right thing. From all this, the sense of guilt arises.

And, there is the rigmarole in religion about sin. But, there are certain obvious things, are there not?—for example, that virtue is essential. But virtue which is cultivated, is no longer virtue; it is merely the strengthening of oneself with a different name. Virtue comes into being only when there is the freedom from desire to be something; when one is not afraid of being nothing. And, it is the repetition of a particular disturbance, of a particular action that has brought misfortune to others and to oneself, which may be called a sin. Surely, that is the first thing, is it not? To see something very clearly, which is discovered in relationship, and not to repeat it. The repetition, surely, is the mistake, not the first action; and to understand that, the repetitive quality of desire, one has to understand the whole structure of oneself.

So, there is this thing called sin, the feeling of guilt. One may have done something wrong, like worry, like gossip; but to keep on at it, surely, is the worst thing that one can do. If you see that you have done something wrong, observe it, go into it thoroughly, and be rid of it—don't keep on repeating it. Because, surely, this sense of worry about something that one has done in the past, or which one may do the next minute, this constant anxiety about it, this fear, only strengthens the restlessness of the mind, does it not? Gossip, worry, indicate the restlessness of the mind. When there is no restlessness, no distraction, but alertness, watchfulness, then the problem disappears, does it not? The feeling of guilt, with the majority of us, holds us in check. But that is only fear; and fear, surely, does not bring about clarity of understanding. In fear there is no communion. And it is that

fear that must be eradicated, not the feeling that one is sinning.

Question: There is no possibility of collective action without a co-ordinated plan, which involves the subservience of the individual will to the common purpose. If individuals were selfless, then control and authority would be needless. How can we achieve a common aim without curbing the erratic will of the individual, even if he is now and then well-intentioned?

KRISHNAMURTI: In order to have collective action, we resort to compulsion or authoritarianism; or to a form of fear, threat, or reward, with which we are all familiar. The State, or a group of individuals, establishes a certain aim, and then compels, coaxes, or persuades others to co-operate by giving them rewards or punishments—all the various ways to bring about co-ordinated action which we know. And the questioner wants to know if the emphasis on the individual, which is implied, does not prevent co-ordinated action. Which means, if there is a common purpose, with which we all agree, then must we not submit to that, and put aside our own will?

How is co-operation possible—that is really the crux of the matter, isn't it? Co-operation, co-ordination in action, lies either through fear, or through intelligence and love. When a particular nation is at war, then there is co-operation through fear; and apparently, fear, hatred, jealousy, brings people together more quickly than intelligence and love. Clever statesmen, politicians, are aware of this, and instigate it—with which, again, we are familiar. But is it possible to bring people together intelligently, through affection? That is really the problem, isn't it? Because, we see more and more people coming together through hatred, through fear, through compulsion—mass movements, the use of psychological

methods to persuade, propaganda, and all the rest of it. And if that is the way, then what we are discussing is futile. But if you do not co-operate, come together, through greed, is there any other way? And, if there is a way, must you not submit the individual will to a higher purpose?

Say, for example, we all agree that there must be peace in the world. And how is that peace possible? Peace is possible only when there is selflessness, surely; when the me is not important. Because I in myself am peaceful, therefore in my actions I will be peaceful; therefore I will not be anti-social. And anything that makes for antagonism, I will put away from myself. Therefore, I must pay the price for peace, must I not? But it must originate from me. And the more of us there are who are for that, surely, the greater the possibility of peace in the world—which does not mean the subservience of the individual will to the whole, to a purpose, to a plan, to an Utopia. Because, I see that there can be no peace until I am peaceful; which means, nationalism, no class, you know, all the things that are involved in being peaceful—which means being completely selfless. And when that is there, then we will co-operate. Then, there is bound to be co-operation. When there is compulsion from the outside to make me co-operate with the State, with a group, I may co-operate, but inwardly I will be fighting, inwardly there is no release. Or I may use the Utopia as a means of self-fulfillment, which is also expansion of oneself.

So, as long as there is the submitting of the individual will to a particular idea through greed, through identification, there must be conflict eventually between the individual and the many. So, the emphasis, surely, is not on the individual and the collective as opposed to each other, but on the freedom from the sense of the me and the mine. If that freedom exists, then there is no question of the individual as opposed

to the collective. But, as that seems almost impossible, we are persuaded to join the collective to produce a certain action, to sacrifice the individual for the whole; and the sacrifice is urged upon us by others, by the leaders. Whereas, we can look at this whole problem, not as concerning the individual and the collective, but intelligently, and realize that there can be no peace as long as you and I are not peaceful in ourselves; and that peace cannot be bought at any price. You and I have to be free from the causes that are producing conflict in ourselves. And the centre of conflict is the self, the me. But most of us do not want to be free from that me. That is the difficulty. Most of us like the pleasures and the pains that the me brings; and as long as we are controlled by the pleasure and the pains of the me, there will be conflict between the me and society, between the me and the collective; and the collective will dominate the me, and destroy the me, if it can. But the me is much stronger than the collective; so it always circumvents it, and tries to get a position in it, to expand, to fulfill.

Surely, the freedom from the self, and therefore the search of reality, the discovery and the coming into being of reality, is the true function of man. Religions play with it in their rituals and rigmarole—you know, the whole business of it. But, if one becomes aware of this whole process, which we have been discussing for so many years, then there is a possibility for the newly awakened intelligence to function. In that there is not self-release, not self-fulfillment, but creativeness. It is this creativeness of reality, which is not of time, that sets one free from all the business of the collective and the individual. Then one is really in a position to help create the new.

August 6, 1949.

VIII

I am sure many of you believe in immortality, in the soul, or the atman, and so on. And perhaps some of you have had a passing experience of these things. But, if I may, I would like this morning to approach it from a different point of view; let us go into it very seriously and earnestly, and discover the truth of it—not according to any particular pattern of belief or religious dogma, or your own personal experience, however vast, however beautiful and romantic it may be. So, please examine what we are going to discuss, intelligently and without any prejudice, with the intention of finding out, rather than rejecting or defending it. Because, it is quite a difficult problem to discuss. The implications are many, and if one can think of it anew, perhaps we shall have a different approach to action and to life.

We seem to think that ideas are very important. Our minds are filled with ideas. Our mind is idea—there is no mind without idea, without thought, without verbalization. And ideas play an extraordinarily important part in our life: what we think, what we feel, the beliefs and ideas in which we are conditioned. Ideas have an extraordinary significance with most of us: ideas which seem coherent, intelligent, logical, and also ideas that are romantic, stupid, without much significance. We are crowded with ideas, our whole structure is based on them. And these ideas come into being, obviously, through external influences and environmental conditioning, as well as through inward demands. We can see very well how ideas come into being. Ideas are sensations. There is no idea without sensation. As most of us feed on sensation, our whole structure is based on ideas. Being limited and seeking expansion through sensation, ideas become very important: ideas on God, ideas on morality, ideas on various forms of

social organization, and so on and so on.

So, ideas shape our experience, which is an obvious fact. That is, ideas condition our action. Not that action creates ideas, but ideas create action. First, we think it out, then we act; and the action is based on ideas. So, experience is the outcome of ideas; but experience is different from experiencing. In the state of experiencing, if you have noticed, there is no ideation at all. There is merely an experiencing, an acting. Later on comes the ideation of likes and dislikes, derived from that experiencing. We either want that experience to continue, or not to continue. If we like it, we go back to the experience in memory, which is a demand for the sensation of that experience—not experiencing anew. Surely, there is a difference between experiencing and experience, and that should be made fairly clear. In experiencing there is not the experiencer and the experience; there is only a state of experiencing. But after experiencing, the sensations of that experiencing are demanded, are longed for; and out of that desire, arises idea.

Say, for example, you have had a pleasurable experience. It is over, and you are longing for it. That is, you are longing for the sensation, not the state of experiencing; and sensation creates ideas, based on pleasure and pain, avoidance and acceptance, denial and continuance. Now, ideas are not basically important, because one sees that ideas have continuity. You may die, but the ideas that you have had, the bundle of ideas which you are, have a continuance, either partially or wholly, either fully manifested, or only a little; but they have a form of continuity, obviously.

So, if ideas are the result of sensation, which they are, and if the mind is filled with ideas, if the mind is idea, then there is a continuance of the mind as a bundle of ideas. But that, surely, is not immortality; because ideas are merely the result of

sensations, of pleasure and not-pleasure ; and immortality must be something which is beyond ideas, upon which the mind cannot possibly speculate ; because it can only speculate in terms of pleasure and pain, avoidance and acceptance. As the mind can only think in those terms, however extensively, however deeply, it is still based on idea ; but thought, idea, has continuity, and that which continues is obviously not immortality. So, to know or to experience immortality, or for the experiencing of that state, there must be no ideation. One cannot think about immortality. If we can be free of ideation, that is, if we do not think in terms of ideas, then there is a state of experiencing only, a state in which ideation has stopped altogether. You can experiment with this yourself, and not accept what I am saying. Because, there is a great deal involved in this. The mind must be entirely quiet, without movement backward or forward, neither delving nor soaring. That is, ideation must entirely cease. And that is extremely difficult. That is why we cling to words like the soul, immortality, continuity, God—they all have neurological effects, which are sensations. And on these sensations the mind feeds ; deprive the mind of these things, it is lost. So, it holds on with great strength to past experiences, which have now become sensations.

Is it possible for the mind to be so quiet—not partially, but in its totality—, as to have direct experience of that which is not thinkable, of that which cannot be put into words ? That which continues is obviously within the limits of time ; and through time, the timeless cannot come into being ; therefore God, or what you will, cannot be thought of. If you think of it, there is merely an idea, a sensation ; therefore it is no longer true. It is merely an idea which has a continuance, which is inherited or conditioned ; and such an idea is not eternal, immortal, timeless. It is

essential to really feel this, see the truth of it as we discuss it—not say, 'This is so, that is not so', 'I believe in immortality, and you don't', 'You are agnostic, and I am godly'. All such expressions are immature, thoughtless, they have no significance. We are dealing with something which is not merely a matter of opinion, of like or dislike, of prejudice. We are trying to find out what is immortality—not as so-called religious people do who belong to some particular cult or other—but to experience that thing, to be aware of it, because, in that is creation. When once there is the experiencing of that, then the whole problem of life undergoes a significant, revolutionary change, and without that, all the squabbles and petty opinions have really no significance at all.

So, one has to be aware of this total process, of how ideas come into being, how action springs from ideas, and how ideas control action and therefore limit action, depending on sensation. It doesn't matter whose ideas they are, whether from the left or from the extreme right. As long as we cling to ideas, we are in a state in which there can be no experiencing at all. Then we are merely living in the field of time—in the past, which gives further sensation, or in the future, which is another form of sensation. It is only when the mind is free from idea that there can be experiencing. Just listen to this, don't reject or accept it. Listen to it, as you would listen to the wind in the trees. You don't object to the wind in the trees ; it's pleasant. Or, if you dislike it, you go away. Do the same thing here. Don't reject, just find out. Because, so many people have expressed their opinion on this question of immortality ; religious teachers speak of it, as does every preacher around the corner. So many saints, so many writers, either deny or assert ; they say that there is immortality, or that man is merely the outcome of environmental influences, and so on and so on—so

many opinions. Opinions are not truth ; and truth is something that must be experienced directly, from moment to moment, it is not an experience which you want—which is then merely sensation. And only when one can go beyond the bundle of ideas—which is the me, which is the mind, which has a partial or complete continuity—, only when one can go beyond that, when thought is completely silent, only then is there a state of experiencing. Then one shall know what truth is.

Question : How is one to know or feel unmistakably the reality, the exact and immutable significance of an experience which is truth ? Whenever I have a realization and feel it to be truth, someone to whom I communicate it tells me I am merely self-deluded. Whenever I think I have understood, someone is there to tell me I am in illusion. Is there a way of knowing what is the truth about myself, without delusion, self-deception ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Any form of identification must lead to illusion. There is the psychiatric illusion, and the psychological illusion. The psychiatric illusion we know what to do with. When one thinks one is Napoleon, or a great saint, you know what to do. But the psychological identification and illusion is quite different. The political, religious person, identifies himself with the country or with God. He is the country ; and, if he has a talent, then he is a nightmare to the rest of the world, whether peacefully or violently. There are various forms of identification : identification with authority, with a country, with an idea ; identification with a belief, which makes one do all kinds of things ; with an ideology, for which you are willing to sacrifice everybody and everything, including yourself and your country, in order to achieve what you want ; identification with

an Utopia, for which you force others into a particular pattern. Then, there is the identification of the actor, playing different roles. And most of us are in that position of acting, posing, whether consciously or unconsciously.

So, our difficulty is that we identify ourselves with a country, with a political party, with propaganda, with a belief, with an ideology, with a leader—all that is one kind of identification.

Then, there is the identification with our own experiences. I have had an experience, a thrilling thing ; and the more I dwell on it, the more intense, the more romantic, the more sentimental, the more blurred it becomes ; and to that I give the name God—you know the innumerable ways of self-deception. Surely, illusion arises when I cling to something. If I have had an experience which is over, finished, and I go back to it, I am in illusion. If I want something repeated, if I hold on to the repetition of an experience, it is bound to lead me to illusion. So, the basis of illusion is identification—identification with an image, with an idea of God, with a voice, or with experiences to which we ardently cling. It is not to the experience that we cling, but to the sensation of that experience which we had at the moment of experiencing. A man who has built around himself various methods of identification is living in illusion. A man who believes, because of a sensation, of an idea to which he clings, is bound to live in illusion, in self-deception. Therefore, any experience about yourself to which you go back, or which you reject, is bound to lead to illusion. Illusion ceases only when you understand an experience and do not hold on to it. This desire to possess is the basis of illusion, of self-deception. You desire to be something ; and this desire to be something, must be understood, in order to understand the process of illusion, of self-deception. If I think I shall be a great teacher, a great Master, the

Buddha, X, Y, Z, in my next life, or if I think that I am that now and hold on to that, surely I must be in illusion; because I live on a sensation, which is an idea, and my mind feeds on ideas, whether false or true.

How is one to know if an experience at a given moment is truth? That is part of the question. Why do you want to know if it is truth? A fact is a fact, it is not true or false. It is only when I want to translate a fact according to my sensation, to my ideation, that I enter into delusion. When I am angry, it is a fact, there is no question of self-deception. When I am lustful, when I am greedy, when I am irritated, it is a fact; it is only when I begin to justify it, find explanations for it, translate it according to my prejudice in my favor, or avoid it—only then I have to ask, 'What is truth?' That is, the moment we approach a fact emotionally, sentimentally, with ideation, then we enter into the world of illusion and self-deceit. To look at a fact and be free of all this requires an extraordinary watchfulness. Therefore, it is most important to find out for oneself, not whether one is in illusion or self-deception, but whether one is free from the desire to identify, from the desire to have a sensation, which you call experience, from the desire to repeat, possess, or revert to an experience. After all, from moment to moment you can know yourself as you are, factually, not through the screen of ideation, which is sensation. To know yourself, there is no necessity to know the truth, or what is not the truth. To look at yourself in the mirror and see that you are ugly or beautiful, factually, not romantically, does not demand truth. But the difficulty with most of us is that when we see the image, the expression, we want to do something about it, we want to alter it, give it a different name: if it is pleasurable, we identify with it; if it is painful, we avoid it. In this process, surely, lies self-deception, with which you are somewhat familiar. The politicians

do that; the priests do it when they talk of God in the name of religion; and we ourselves do it when we are caught up in the sensation of ideas and hold on to them—that is true, this is false, the Masters exist or don't exist—which is all so absurd and immature and childish. But to find out what is factual, one needs an extraordinary alertness, an awareness in which there is neither condemnation nor justification.

So, one can say that one deceives oneself, and there is illusion, when there is identification with a country, with a belief, with an idea, with a person, and so on; or when there is the desire to repeat an experience, which is the sensation of the experience; or when one goes back to childhood, and wants the repetition of the experiences of childhood, the delight, the nearness, the sensitivity; or when one wants to be something. It is extremely difficult not to be deceived, either by oneself or by another; and deception ceases only when there is no desire to be something. Then the mind is capable of looking at things as they are, of seeing the significance of what is; then there is no battle between the false and the true; then there is no search for truth apart from the false. So, the important thing is to understand the process of the mind; and that understanding is factual, not theoretical, not sentimental, romantic, going into dark rooms and thinking it all out, having images, visions—all that has nothing to do with reality. And, as most of us are sentimental, romantic, seeking sensation, we are caught by ideas; and ideas are not what is. So, the mind that is free of ideas, which are sensations, such a mind is free from illusion.

Question : Experience shows that understanding arises only when argumentation and conflict cease, and a kind of tranquillity or intellectual sympathy is realized. This is true even in the understanding of mathe-

matical and technical problems. However, this tranquillity has been experienced only after every effort of analysis, examination, or experimentation has been made. Does this mean that this effort is a necessary, though not sufficient preliminary, to the tranquillity ?

KRISHNAMURTI : I hope you have understood the question. The questioner, to put it briefly, asks : Is not effort, digging, analyzing, examining, necessary before there is tranquillity of the mind ? Before the mind can understand, is not effort necessary ? That is, is not technique necessary before creativeness ? If I have a problem, must I not go into it, think it out fully, search it out, analyze it, dissect it, worry over it, and be free of it ? Then, when the mind is quiet, the answer is found. This is the process we go through. We have a problem, we think about it, we question it, we talk it over ; and then the mind, becoming weary of it, is quiet. Then, the answer is found, unknowingly. With that process we are familiar. And the questioner asks : Is that not necessary, first ?

Why do I go through that process ? Don't let us put this question wrongly, whether it is necessary or not, but why do I go through that process ? I go through that process, obviously, in order to find an answer. My anxiety is to find an answer, isn't it ? That fear of not finding an answer, makes me do all these things ; and then, after going through this process, I am exhausted, and say, 'I can't answer it'. Then the mind becomes quiet, and then there is an answer, sometimes or always.

So, the question is not, is the preliminary process necessary, but *why* do I go through that process ? Obviously, because I am seeking an answer. I am not interested in the problem, but in how to get away from the problem. I am not seeking the understanding of the problem, but the *answer* to the problem. Surely, there is a difference, isn't

there ? Because, the answer is in the problem, not away from the problem. I go through the searching, analyzing, dissecting process, in order to escape from the problem. But, if I do not escape from the problem and try to look at the problem without any fear or anxiety, if I merely look at the problem, mathematical, political, religious, or any other, and not look to an answer, then the problem will begin to tell me. Surely, this is what happens. We go through this process, and eventually throw it aside because there is no way out of it. So, why can't we start right from the beginning, that is, not seek an answer to a problem ?—which is extremely arduous, isn't it ? Because, the more I understand the problem, the more significance there is in it. To understand it, I must approach it quietly, not impose on the problem my ideas, my feelings of like and dislike. Then the problem will reveal its significance.

Why is it not possible to have tranquillity of the mind right from the beginning ? And there will be tranquillity, only when I am not seeking an answer, when I am not afraid of the problem. Our difficulty is the fear involved in the problem. So, if one puts the question whether it is necessary or not to make an effort, one receives a false answer.

Let us look at it differently. A problem demands attention, not distraction through fear ; and there is no attention when we are seeking an answer away from the problem, an answer that will suit us, that will be preferable, that will give us satisfaction or avoidance. In other words, if we can approach the problem without any of these, then it is possible to understand the problem.

So, the question is not whether we should go through this process of analyzing, examining, dissecting, whether it is necessary in order to have tranquillity. Tranquillity comes into being when we are not afraid ; and because we are afraid of the problem, of the issue of the problem, we

are caught in the desires of our own pursuits, the pursuits of our own desires.

Question : I no longer suppress my thoughts, and I am shocked by what sometimes arises. Can I be as bad as that ? (Laughter).

KRISHNAMURTI : It is good to be shocked, isn't it ? Shock implies sensitivity, doesn't it ? But, if you are not shocked, if you merely say there is a certain thing in you which you do not like, and you are going to discipline it, change it, then you are shock-proof, are you not ? (Laughter) No, please don't laugh it away. Because, most of us want to be shock-proof ; we do not want to know what we are, and that is why we have learnt to suppress, to discipline, to destroy the neighbor and ourselves, for our country and for ourselves. We don't want to know ourselves as we are. So, to discover oneself as one is, is a shocking thing ; and it should be. Because, we want it to be different ; we like to think of ourselves, picture ourselves as being beautiful, noble, this or that—which is all a resistance. Our virtue has become merely resistance, and therefore it is no longer virtue. To be sensitive to what one is, requires a certain spontaneity ; and in that spontaneity, one discovers. But, if you have suppressed, disciplined your thoughts and feelings so completely that there is no spontaneity, then there is no possibility of discovering anything ; and I am not at all sure that is not what most of us want—to become inwardly dead. Because, it is much easier to live that way—to give ourselves to an idea, to a belief, to an organization, to service, to God knows what else—and function automatically. It is much easier. But to be sensitive, to be aware inwardly of all the possibilities, is much too dangerous, much too painful ; and we use a respectable way of dulling ourselves, an approved form of discip-

line, suppression, sublimation, denial—you know, the various practices which make us dull, insensitive.

Now, when you discover what you are, which, as the questioner says, is bad, what will you do with it ? Previously, you have suppressed, and therefore never discovered, now you no longer suppress, and you discover what you are. What is your next response ? Surely, that is much more important—how you deal with it, how you approach it. Then what happens, when you discover that you are what you call bad ? What do you do ? The moment you discover, your mind is already at work on it, isn't it ? Haven't you noticed it ? I discover that I am mean. It is a shock to me. What do I do ? The mind then says, 'I must not be mean', so it cultivates generosity. Generosity of the hand is one thing, and generosity of the heart is another. The cultivation of generosity is of the hand, and you cannot cultivate generosity of the heart. If you do cultivate the generosity of the heart, then you fill the heart with the things of the mind. So, what do we do when we discover certain things that are not generous ? Watch yourselves, please, don't wait for my answer, my explanation—look at it, and experience it as we go along together. Not that this is a psychology class ; but surely, in listening to something like this, we must experience and be free as we go along, not continue day after day in the same stupid way.

So, what do we do ? The instinctive response is either to justify or to deny, which is to make ourselves insensitive. But to see it as it is, to see that I am mean, and then to stop there, without giving any explanations—merely to know that one is mean, is an extraordinary thing ; which means there is no verbalization, no naming even of that feeling which one has. If one really stops there, then one will see there is an extraordinary transformation. Then one is aware extensively of the implications of that feeling ; then one

doesn't have to do a thing with regard to that feeling. Because, when you don't name a thing, it withers away. Experiment with it and you will find out what an extraordinary quality of awareness comes into being when you are not naming or justifying, but merely looking, silently observing the fact, that you are not generous, or that you are mean. I am using the words generous, mean, only for communication. The word is not the thing; so, don't be carried away by the word. But look at this thing. Surely, it is important to discover what one is; to be surprised and shocked to discover what one is, when one thought one was so marvellous. It is all romantic and idiotic and stupid to think one is this or that. So, when you put all that aside and merely look at what is—which needs an extraordinary alertness, not courage, not virtue—, when you no longer suppress it, justify it, condemn it, or give it a name—then you will see there is a transformation.

Question: What is it that determines the duration between the perception of one's thought-feeling, and the modification or permanent disappearance of the condition perceived? In other words, why is it that certain undesirable conditions in oneself do not vanish as soon as they are observed?

KRISHNAMURTI: Surely, that depends on right attention, doesn't it? When one perceives an undesirable quality—I am using these words merely to communicate; I am not giving any special significance to 'perceiving'—, there is an interval of time before there is transformation; and the questioner wants to know, why? Surely, the interval between perception and change depends on attention. Is there attention if I am merely resisting that, if I am condemning or justifying it? Surely, there is no attention. I am

merely avoiding it. If I am trying to overcome it, discipline it, change it, that is not attention, is it? There is attention only when I am fully interested in the thing itself—not how to transform it; for then I am merely avoiding, being distracted, running away. So, what is important is, not what takes place, but to have that capacity of right attention when one discovers an undesirable thing; and there is no right attention if there is any form of identification, any feeling of pleasure or displeasure. Surely, that is very clear: the moment I am distracted by my pleasure of wanting it, or not wanting it, there is no attention. If that is very clear, then the problem is simple. Then there is no interval. But we like the interval. We like to go through all this rigmarole of labyrinthine ways to avoid the thing which we have to tackle. And we have cultivated marvellously and sedulously the escapes; and the escapes have become more important than the thing itself. But if one sees the escapes, not verbally, but actually sees that one is escaping, then there is right attention; then one doesn't have to struggle against the escapes. When you see a poisonous thing, you don't have to escape; it is a poisonous thing, you leave it alone. Similarly, right attention is spontaneous when the problem is really great; when the shock is intense. Then there is immediate response. But when the shock, the problem is not great—and we take care not to make any problem too great—, then our minds are made dull and weary.

Question: Is the artist, the musician, engaged in a futile thing? I am not speaking of one who takes up art or music, but one who is inherently an artist. Would you go into this?

KRISHNAMURTI: It is a very complicated problem, so let us go into it slowly. As the questioner says, there

are two types of people, those who are inherently artists, and those who take up art or music. Those who take it up, obviously, do it either for sensation, for upliftment, for various forms of escape, or merely as an amusement, an addiction. You might take it up as another takes up drink, or an 'ism', or religious dogma: perhaps it is less harmful, because you are by yourself. Then, there is the other type, the artist—if there is such a person. Inherently, for itself, he paints, plays or composes music, and all the rest of it. Now, what happens to that person? You must know such people. What is happening to him as an individual, n, n social entity? What is happening to such a person? The danger, for all those people who have a capacity, a gift, is that they think they are superior, first of all. They think they are the salt of the earth. They are people especially chosen from above; and, with that feeling of apartness, of being chosen, all the evils come: they are anti-social, they are individualistic, aggressive, extraordinarily self-centered—almost all gifted people are like that. So, gift, capacity, is a danger, is it not? Not that one can avoid the talent or the capacity; but one must be aware of the implications, the dangers of it. Such people may come together in a laboratory, or in a gathering of musicians and artists, but they have always this barrier between themselves and others, have they not? You are the layman, and I am the specialist; the man who knows more, and the man who knows less, and all the identification that goes with it.

I am not speaking slightlying of anybody, because that would be too stupid; but one must be aware of all these things. To point them out is not to abuse or deride somebody. Few of us are inherently artists, first of all. We like to play with it, because it is profitable, or gives certain éclat, a certain show, certain verbal expressions which we have learnt. It gives us a place, a position. And

if we are artists, really, genuinely, surely there is the quality of sensitivity, not of isolation. Art does not belong to any particular country, or to any particular person; but the artist soon makes his gift into the personal—he paints, it is his work, his poem; it puffs him up, like the rest of us. And therefore, he becomes anti-social, he is more important. And, as most of us are not in that position, fortunately or unfortunately, we use music or art merely as sensation. We may have a quick experience when we hear something lovely, but the repetition of that thing over and over and over again soon dulls us. It is merely the sensation we indulge in. If we do not indulge in that, then beauty has quite a different significance. Then we approach it anew every time. And it is this fresh approach to something every time, whether ugly or beautiful, that is important, that makes for sensitivity; but you cannot be sensitive if you are captured by your own addiction or capacity, by your own delight, by your own sensation. Surely, the really creative person comes to things anew, he does not merely repeat what the radio announcer has told him, or what the critics say.

So, the difficulty in this is to keep that sensitivity all the time, to be alert, whether you are an artist, or merely playing with art. And that sensitivity is dulled when you give importance to yourself as the artist. You may have vision, and you may have the capacity to put that vision into paint, into marble, into words; but the moment you identify yourself with it, you are lost, it is finished. You lose that sensitivity. The world loves to praise you, to say what a marvellous artist you are; and you like that. And, for most of us, who are not great artists inherently, our difficulty is not to get lost in sensations, because sensations dull; through sensations you cannot experience. Experiencing comes only when there is direct relationship;

and there is no direct relationship when there is the screen of sensation, the desire to be, to alter, or to continue. So, our problem is to keep alert and sensitive; and that is denied when we are merely seeking sensation and the repetition of sensation.

August 7, 1949.

IX

I think I will only answer questions this evening and not give the usual preliminary talk; but before answering, I would like to point out one or two things concerning these questions and answers.

First of all, most of us are very inclined to believe. The mind is very clever in persuading us to think differently, to adopt a new point of view, or to believe in things that are not fundamentally true. Now, in answering these questions, I would like to say that I am not persuading you to think along my particular line. We are trying to find the right answer together. I am not answering for you just to accept or deny. We are going to find out together what is true, and that requires an open mind, an intelligent mind, an enquiring mind, an alert mind; not a mind that is so prejudiced that it merely denies, or so eager that it accepts. And, in answering these questions, one fundamental thing must be borne in mind. It is that they are merely a reflection of the ways of our own thinking, they reveal to us what we think. They should act as a mirror in which we perceive ourselves. After all, these discussions, these talks, have only one purpose, and that is the pursuit of self-knowledge. For, as I said, it is only in knowing ourselves first—deeply, profoundly, not superficially—that we can know truth. And it is extremely arduous to know ourselves deeply, not superficially. It is not a matter of time, but a question of intensity; it is direct perception and experience that are important. And

these discussions and talks are meant for that; so that each one of us may experience directly whatever is being discussed, and not merely understand it on the verbal level. It is important also to bear in mind that each of us must find the truth, each of us must be the Master and the pupil; and that requires a great deal of humility, not mere acceptance of assurance or denial from me.

So, when I answer these questions, please bear all this in mind. Because, all of us have innumerable problems. Life is not very pleasant or simple; it is very complicated; and we can understand it only when we understand the whole, total process; and the total process is in us, not outside of us. Therefore, it is important to understand ourselves. Then we can deal with the things that we face every day, the influences that are constantly impinging upon us.

Question : Gossip has value in self-revelation, especially in revealing others to me. Seriously, why not use gossip as a means of discovering what is? I do not shiver at the word 'gossip' just because it has been condemned for ages.

KRISHNAMURTI : I wonder why we gossip? Not because it reveals others to us. And why should others be revealed to us? Why do you want to know others? Why this extraordinary concern about others? First of all, Sir, why do we gossip? It is a form of restlessness, is it not? Like worry, it is an indication of a restless mind. And why this desire to interfere with others, to know what others are doing, saying? It is a very superficial mind that gossips, isn't it? An inquisitive mind which is wrongly directed. The questioner seems to think that others are revealed to him by his being concerned with them—with their doings, with their thoughts, with their opinions. But, do we know

others if we don't know ourselves ? Can we judge others, if we do not know the way of our own thinking, the way we act, the way we behave ? And why this extraordinary concern over others ? Is it not an escape, really, this desire to find out what others are thinking and feeling, and gossiping about ? Doesn't it offer an escape from ourselves ? And, is there not in it also the desire to interfere with others' lives ? Isn't our own life sufficiently difficult, sufficiently complex, sufficiently painful, without dealing with others, interfering with others ? Is there time to think about others in that gossipy, cruel, ugly manner ? Why do we do this ? You know, everybody does it. Practically everybody gossips about somebody else. Why ?

I think, first of all, we gossip about others because we are not sufficiently interested in the process of our own thinking and of our own action. We want to see what others are doing, and perhaps, to put it kindly, to imitate others. Generally when we gossip, it is to condemn others. But, stretching it charitably, it is perhaps to imitate others. Why do we want to imitate others ? Doesn't it all indicate an extraordinary shallowness on our own part ? It is an extraordinarily dull mind that wants excitement, and goes outside of itself to get it. In other words, gossip is a form of sensation, isn't it ?, in which we indulge. It may be a different kind of sensation, but there is always this desire to find excitement, distraction. And so, if one really goes into this question deeply, one comes back to oneself, which shows that one is really extraordinarily shallow and seeking excitement from outside by talking about others. Catch yourself the next time you are gossiping about somebody ; and if you are aware of it, it will indicate an awful lot to you about yourself. Don't cover it up by saying that you are merely inquisitive about others. It indicates restlessness, a sense of excitement, a shallowness, a lack of real, profound

interest in people which has nothing to do with gossip.

Now, the next problem is, how to stop gossip. That is the next question, isn't it ? When you are aware that you are gossiping, how do you stop gossiping ? If it has become a habit, an ugly thing that continues day after day, how do you stop it ? Does that question arise ? When you know you are gossiping, when you are aware that you are gossiping, aware of all its implications, do you then say to yourself, 'How am I to stop it ?' Does it not stop of its own accord, the moment you are aware that you are gossiping ? The 'how' does not arise at all. The 'how' arises only when you are unaware ; and, surely, gossip indicates a lack of awareness. Experiment with this for yourself the next time you are gossiping, and see how quickly, how immediately you stop gossiping when you are aware of what you are talking about, aware that your tongue is running away with you. It does not demand the action of will to stop it. All that is necessary is to be aware, to be conscious of what you are saying, and to see the implications of it. You don't have to condemn or justify gossip. Be aware of it, and you will see how quickly you stop gossiping ; because it reveals to oneself one's own ways of action, one's behaviour, thought pattern ; and in that revelation, one discovers oneself, which is far more important than gossiping about others, about what they are doing, what they are thinking, how they behave.

Most of us, who read daily newspapers, are filled with gossip, global gossip. It is all an escape from ourselves, from our own pettiness, from our own ugliness. We think that through a superficial interest in world events we are becoming more and more wise, more capable of dealing with our own lives. All these, surely, are ways of escaping from ourselves, are they not ? Because, in ourselves we are so empty, shallow ; we are so frightened of

ourselves. We are so poor in ourselves that gossip acts as a form of rich entertainment, an escape from ourselves. We try to fill that emptiness in us with knowledge, with rituals, with gossip, with group meetings—with the innumerable ways of escape. So, the escapes become all-important, and not the understanding of what is. The understanding of what is, demands attention; to know that one is empty, that one is in pain, needs immense attention, and not escapes. But most of us like these escapes, because they are much more pleasurable, more pleasant. Also, when we know ourselves as we are, it is very difficult to deal with ourselves; and that is one of the problems with which we are faced. We don't know what to do. When I know that I am empty, that I am suffering, that I am in pain, I don't know what to do, how to deal with it. And so we resort to all kinds of escapes.

So, the question is, what to do? Of course, obviously, one cannot escape; for that is most absurd and childish. But when you are faced with yourself as you are, what are you to do? First, is it possible not to deny or justify it, but just to remain with it, as you are?—which is extremely arduous, because the mind seeks explanation, condemnation, identification. If it does not do any of those things but remains with it, then it is like accepting something. If I accept that I am brown, that is the end of it; but if I am desirous of changing to a lighter color, then the problem arises. So, to accept what is, is most difficult; and one can do that only when there is no escape; and condemnation or justification is a form of escape. So, when one understands the whole process of why one gossips, and, when one realizes the absurdity of it, the cruelty and all the things involved in it, then one is left with what one is; and we approach it always either to destroy it, or to change it into something else. But, if we don't do either of those

things, but approach it with the intention of understanding it, being with it completely, then we will find that it is no longer the thing that we dreaded. Then there is a possibility of transforming that which is.

Question : We have a collection of ideals, and the choice is wide. We try to realize them through various methods. This is a long and time-taking way. In listening to you, I feel that the distinction or space between ideal and practice is illusory. Is this so?

KRISHNAMURTI : First of all, are we aware, each one of us, that we have ideals; and that, having these ideals, we are trying to practise them, or live up to them, or approximate ourselves to them? Take the question of violence. We have the ideal of non-violence, and we try to practise that ideal in our daily lives. Or take any other ideal that you have. We are trying to live up to it all the time, to practise it, if we are serious and not merely living on the verbal level. And that takes time, a constant application, a series of failures, and so on.

Why do we have ideals? Any collection of them, why do we have them? Do they better our lives? And is virtue to be gained through constant disciplining? Is virtue a result? Or is it something quite different? Take humility. Can you practise humility? Or does humility come into being when the self is not important? Then the me and the mine do not predominate. But if we make that into an ideal, that the self should not predominate, then arises the question, how to come to that state? So, this whole process is very complicated and unreal, is it not? There must be a different approach to this problem, surely? Is not a collection of ideals, an escape? Because, it gives us time to play with it. We say, 'I am practising it, I am disciplining myself; one day I will

be that; it is necessary to go slowly, to evolve towards it—you know all the various explanations that we give.

Now, is there a different approach? Because, we can see that the constant disciplining towards an ideal, approximating oneself to an ideal, does not really bring about the solution of the problem. We are no more kindly. We are not less violent. We may be, superficially—but not fundamentally. So, how is one, then, to be non-greedy without having the ideal of non-greed? Suppose, for example, I am greedy, or I am mean, or angry—any of these things. The ordinary process is to have an ideal, and try to approximate myself to that ideal all the time through practice, discipline, and so on. Does that free me from greed, from anger, from violence? What will free me from violence is to be free from my desire to be something, from my desire to gain something, to protect something, to achieve a result, and so on. So, our difficulty is, is it not?, that, having these ideals, there is this constant desire to be something, to become something; and that is really the crux of the matter. After all, greed or anger is one of the expressions of the me, the self, the I; and as long as that I remains, anger will continue. Merely to discipline it to function in a certain way does not free it from anger. This process only emphasizes the self, the me, does it not?

Now, if I realize that I am angry or greedy, need I go through all the disciplinary process in order to be free from it? Is there not a different approach to it, a different way of tackling it? I can tackle it differently only when I no longer take pleasure in sensation. Anger gives me a sensation of pleasure, doesn't it?; though I may dislike it afterwards, at the time there is an excitement involved in it. It is a release. So, the first thing, it seems to me, is to be aware of this process, to see that the ideal does not eradicate anything. It is merely a form of postponement. That

is, to understand something, I must give it full attention; and an ideal is merely a distraction which prevents my giving that feeling or that quality full attention at a given time. If I am fully aware, if I give my full attention to the quality I call greed, without the distraction of an ideal, then am I not in a position to understand greed and so dissolve it? You see, we are so accustomed to postponement, and ideals help us to postpone, but if we can put away all ideals because we understand the escapes, the postponing quality of an ideal, and face the thing as it is, directly, immediately, give our full attention to it—then, surely, there is a possibility of transforming it.

If I realize that I am violent, if I am aware of it without trying to transform it or become non-violent—if I am merely aware of it, then, because my attention is fully given to it, it opens up the various implications of violence, and therefore, surely, there is an inward transformation. But if I practise non-violence, or non-greed, or what you will, then I am merely postponing, am I not?, because I am not giving my attention to what is, which is greed or violence. You see, most of us have ideals either as a means of postponing, or to be something, to achieve a result. In the very desire to become the ideal, surely there is violence involved. In the very becoming of something, moving myself towards a goal, surely violence is involved, is it not? You see, we all want to be something. We want to be happy, we want to be more beautiful, we want to be more virtuous, we want to be more and more and more. Surely, in the very desire for something more there is violence involved, there is greed involved. But, if we realize that the more we want to be something, the more conflict there is, then we can see that the ideal merely helps us to increase our conflict—which doesn't mean that I am satisfied with what I am. On the contrary. As long as I want to be something more, there

must be conflict, there must be pain. There must be anger, violence. If I really feel that, if I am profoundly affected by it, see it, am aware of it, then I am able to deal with the problem immediately, without having a collection of ideals to encourage me to be this or that. Then my action is immediate, my relationship with it is direct.

But there also arises in this another problem, which is that of the experiencer and the experience. With most of us, the experiencer and the experience are two different processes. The ideal and myself are two different states. I want to become that. Therefore, the I, the experiencer, the thinker, is different from the thought. Is that so? Is the thinker different from the thought? Or is there only thought, which creates the thinker? So, as long as I am separate from the thought, I can manipulate thought, I can change it, transform it. But is the I, who is operating on a thought, different from the thought? Surely, they are a joint phenomenon, are they not? The thinker and the thought are one, not separate. When one is angry, one is angry: there is an integrated feeling which we term anger. Then I say, 'I am angry': therefore, I separate myself from that anger, and then I can operate on it, do something about it. But if I realize that I am anger, that I am that quality itself, that the quality is not separable from me, surely, when I experience that, then there is quite a different action, quite a different approach. Now, we separate ourselves from the thought, from the feeling, from the quality. Therefore, the I is a separate entity from the quality, and therefore the I can operate on the quality. But the quality is not different from the I, from the thinker; and when there is that integrated experience in which the thinker and the thought are one, not separate, then, surely, there is quite a different approach, a different response. Again, experiment with this and you will see. Because, at the moment of ex-

periencing there is neither the experiencer nor the experience. It is only as the experiencing fades that there is the experiencer and the experience. Then, the experiencer says, 'I like that', or, 'I don't like it'; 'I want more of it', or, 'I want less of it'. Then, he wants to cultivate the ideal, to become the ideal. But if the thinker is the thought, and there are not two separate processes, then his whole attitude is transformed, is it not? Then there is quite a different response with regard to thought; then there is no longer approximating thought to an ideal, or getting rid of thought; then there is no maker of effort. And I think it is really very important to discover this for oneself, to experience this directly, not because I say so or someone else says so. It is important to come to this experience: that the thinker is the thought. Don't let that become a new jargon, a new set of words which we use. Through verbalization we don't experience. We merely have sensations, and sensations are not experience. And if one can be aware of this joint phenomenon, of this process in which the thinker and the thought are one, then I think the problem will be understood much more profoundly than when we merely have ideals or have none, which is really beside the point.

If I am my thoughts, and my thoughts are not different from me, then there is no maker of effort, is there? Then I do not become that; then I am no longer cultivating virtue. Not that I am already virtuous. The moment I am conscious that I am virtuous, I am not virtuous. The moment I am conscious that I am humble, surely humility ceases. So, if I can understand the maker of effort—the me becoming its own self-projected demands, desires, which are the same as myself—then, surely, there is a radical transformation in my whole outlook. That is why it is important to have right meditation, to know what right meditation means. It is not the approximation to an ideal.

it is not trying to reach out and get something, it is not to attain, to concentrate, to develop certain qualities, and so on, which we discussed previously. Right meditation is the understanding of this whole process of the me, of the self. Because, as I said, right meditation is self-knowledge ; and without meditation, one cannot find out what the process of the self is. If there is no meditator to meditate upon something, then meditation is the experiencing of that which is, the total process of the thinker as the thought. Then only is there a possibility that the mind can be really quiet. Then it is possible to discover if there is something beyond the mind—which is not a mere verbal assertion that there is or that there is not, that there is *atman*, the soul, or what you will ; we are not discussing those things. It is going beyond all verbal expression. Then the mind is quiet—not merely on the higher level, the upper level of the mind, but the whole content of the mind, the whole consciousness, is quiet. But there is no quietness if there is a maker of effort ; and there will be the maker, the will of action, as long as he thinks he is separate from the thought. And this requires a great deal of going into, of thinking out, not just experiencing it superficially and sensationally. And when one has that direct experience, then becoming the ideal is illusory, it has no meaning at all. Then it is altogether a wrong approach. Then one sees that this whole process of becoming the more, the greater, has nothing to do with reality. Reality comes into being only when the mind is completely quiet, when there is no effort. Virtue is that state of freedom in which there is no maker of effort. Therefore, virtue is a state in which effort has completely ceased ; but if you make an effort to become virtuous, surely it is no longer virtue, is it ?

So, as long as we do not understand, do not experience that the thinker and the thought are one, all these problems will exist. But the moment we

experience that, the maker of effort comes to an end. To experience that, one must be completely aware of the process of one's own thinking and feeling, of one's desire to become. And that is why it is important, if one is really seeking reality, or God, or what you will, to see that this whole mentality of climbing, evolving, growing, achieving, must come to an end. We are much too worldly. With the mentality of the clerk becoming the boss, the foreman becoming the executive—with that mentality we approach reality. We think we will do the same thing, climb the ladder of success. I am afraid it cannot be done that way. If you do, you will live in a world of illusion, and therefore of conflict, pain, misery and strife. But if one discards all such mentality, such thoughts, such points of view, then one becomes really humble. One is, not becomes. Then there is a possibility of having a direct experience of reality, which alone will dissolve all our problems—not our cunning efforts, not our great intellect, not our deep and wide knowledge.

Question : I am free from ambition. Is there something wrong with me ? (Laughter).

KRISHNAMURTI : If you are conscious that you are free from ambition, then there is something wrong. (Laughter) Then one becomes smug, respectable, unimaginative, thoughtless. Why should you be free from ambition ? And how do you know you are free from ambition ? Surely, to have the desire to be free from something is the beginning of illusion, is it not ?, of ignorance. You see, we find ambition painful ; we want to be something, and we have failed. And so now we say, 'It is too painful, I will get rid of it'. If you succeeded in your ambition, if you fulfilled yourself in the thing which you want to be, then this problem wouldn't arise. But, not succeeding, and seeing there is no fulfillment there, you discard it

and condemn ambition. Obviously, ambition is unworthy. A man who is ambitious, surely, cannot find reality. He may become the president of some club or some society or some country. But surely, he is not seeking reality. But the difficulty is, with most of us, if we don't succeed in what we want, we either become bitter, cynical, or we try to become spiritual. So we say, 'That is a wrong thing to do', and we discard it. But our mentality is the same. We may not succeed in the world and be a great person there, but 'spiritually' we still want to succeed—in a little group, as a leader. Ambition is the same, whether it is in the world, or turned towards God. To know consciously that you are free from ambition is surely an illusion, is it not? And if you are really free of it, can there be any question that you are or are not? Surely one knows within oneself when one is ambitious, does one not? And we can see very well all the effects of ambition in the world—the ruthlessness of it, the cruelty of it, the desire for power, position, prestige. But when one is consciously free of something, is there not the danger of becoming very respectable, of being smug, satisfied with oneself?

I assure you, it is a very difficult thing to be alert, to be aware, to walk delicately, sensitively, not to be caught in the opposites. It requires a great deal of alertness and intelligence and watchfulness. And then, even if you are free from ambition, where are you? Are you any more kindly, any more intelligent, any more sensitive to the outward and inward events? Surely, there is a danger in all this, is there not?, of becoming stultified, of becoming static, becoming dull, weary; and the more one is sensitive, alert, watchful, the more there is a possibility of really being free—not free from this or that. Freedom requires intelligence, and intelligence is not a thing that you sedulously cultivate. Intelligence is something which can be

experienced directly in relationship, not through the screen of what you think the relationship should be. After all, our life is a process of relationship. Life is relationship. And that requires an extraordinary watchfulness, alertness, not speculating whether you are free or not free from ambition. But ambition perverts that relationship. The ambitious man is an isolated man, therefore he cannot have relationship, either with his wife or with society. Life is relationship, whether with the one or with the many, and that relationship is perverted, is destroyed, is corrupted through ambition; and when one is aware of that corruption, surely, there is no question of being free from it.

So, in all this, our difficulty is to be watchful, to be watchful of what we are thinking, feeling, saying—not in order to transform it into something else, but just to be aware of it. And if we are so aware—in which there is no condemnation, no justification, but mere attention, full cognizance of what is—that awareness in itself has an extraordinary effect. But if we are merely trying to become less, or more, then there is dullness, weariness, a smug respectability; and a man who is respectable, surely, can never find reality. Awareness demands a great deal of inward discontent which is not easily canalized through any satisfaction or gratification.

Now, if we see all this, all that we have discussed this evening, not merely on the verbal level, but really experience it, not at odd moments, not when we are pushed into a corner as perhaps some of you are now, but every day, from moment to moment; if we are aware, silently observing, then we become extremely sensitive—not sentimental, which only blurs, distorts. To be sensitive inwardly needs great simplicity—not wearing a loin cloth, or having few clothes, or no car; but the simplicity in which the me and the mine are not important, in which there is no sense of

possession; a simplicity in which there is no longer the maker of effort. Then there is a possibility of experiencing that reality, or of that reality coming into being. After all, this is the only thing that can bring about real, lasting happiness. Happiness is not an end in itself. It is a by-product, and it comes into being only with reality. Not that you go after reality—you cannot. It must come to you. And it can come to you only when there is complete freedom, silence. Not that you become silent. That is a wrong process of meditation. There is a vast difference between being silent and becoming silent. When there is real silence, not put together, then there is something inexplicable, then creation comes into being.

August 13, 1949.

X

For the last five weeks we have been discussing the importance of self-knowledge; for without knowing oneself, not partially, but fully, integrally, it is not possible to think rightly, and therefore act rightly. Without self-knowledge there cannot be complete, integrated action. There can only be partial action if there is no self-knowledge; and as partial action invariably leads to conflict and to misery, it is important for those who would really understand the problems of life completely, to understand the problem of relationship—not only with one or two, but with the whole, which is society. To understand this problem of relationship, we must understand ourselves; and to understand ourselves is action, it is not a withdrawal from action. There is action only when we understand relationship—relationship not only with people and ideas, but with things, with nature. So, action is relationship with regard to things, to property, to nature, to people, and to ideas. Without the comprehension of

all this process, which we call life, life must be contradictory, painful and a constant conflict. So, to understand this process of life, which is ourselves, we have to understand the whole significance of our own thoughts and feelings; and that is why we have been discussing the importance of self-knowledge. Perhaps some of us have read a few books on psychology, have some smattering of psycho-analytical phrases; but I am afraid mere superficial knowledge is not sufficient. Verbal expression of an understanding which comes through mere knowledge, mere study, is not sufficient. What is important is to understand ourselves in relationship; and that relationship is not static, it is constantly in motion. Therefore, to follow that relationship there must be no fixation on an idea. Most of us are slaves to ideas. We are ideas. We are a bundle of ideas. Our actions are shaped by ideas, and our whole outlook is conditioned by ideas. Therefore, ideas shape our relationship. That shaping of relationship by an idea prevents the understanding of relationship. To us, idea is very important, extraordinarily significant. You have your ideas, and I have my ideas, and we are in constant conflict over ideas; whether political, religious, or otherwise, each is in opposition to others. Ideas invariably create opposition, because ideas are the outcome of sensation; and as long as our relationship is conditioned by sensation, by idea, there is no understanding of that relationship. Hence ideas prevent action. Ideas do not further action—they limit action, which we see in everyday life.

So, is it possible for action to be without idea? Can we act without ideation first? Because, we see how ideas divide people—ideas which are beliefs, prejudices, sensations, political and religious opinions. These are dividing people and tearing the world to pieces at the present time. The cultivation of the intellect has become the predominant factor, and our

intellect guides, shapes our action. So, is it possible to act without idea? We do act without idea when the problem is really intense, very profound, demanding all our attention. We may try to conform the act to an idea; but if we go into the problem, if we really try to understand the problem itself, we will begin to discard the idea, the prejudice, the particular point of view, and approach the problem afresh. This is what we do when we have a problem, surely. We try to solve the problem according to a particular idea, or depending on a particular result, and so on. When the problem cannot be solved that way, then we push aside all ideas; then we give up our ideas, and therefore approach the problem afresh, with a quiet mind. We do this unconsciously. Surely, this is what happens, isn't it? When you have a problem, you worry over it. You want a particular result from that problem, or you translate that problem according to certain ideas. You go through all that process, and yet the problem is not solved. So, the mind, becoming weary, stops thinking about the problem. Then it is quiet, it is relaxed, it is not worried over the problem. And presently, as often happens, the solution of the problem is immediately perceived, there is a hint with regard to that problem.

So, action, surely, does not lie in conforming to a particular idea. Then it is merely a continuation of thought, it is not action. And, can we not live without conforming action to an idea? Because, ideas continue; and if we conform action to an idea, then we give continuity to action, and therefore, there is an identification with action as the me and the mine. Therefore, the strengthening, through ideation, of the me, which is the source of all conflict and misery.

Surely, immortality is not an idea. It is something beyond ideation, beyond thought, beyond the bundle of memories, which are all the me. And there is the experiencing of that state

only when ideation stops, when the thinking process stops. The experiencing of that which we call the immortal, the timeless state, is not the product of thought; because thought is merely the continuance of memory, the response to memory; and the experiencing of that extraordinary state can only come into being with the understanding of the self—not through trying to reach it, because that is merely trying to experience something which is self-projected, therefore unreal. For this reason it is important to understand the whole, total process of our consciousness, which we call the me and the mine, which can be understood only in relationship, not in isolation.

That is why it is imperative for those who would really understand truth, or reality, or God, or what you will, to fully grasp the significance of relationship; because that is the only action. If relationship is based on idea, then action is not. If I try to circumscribe my relationship, conform or limit it to an idea, which most of us do, then it is not action, there is no understanding in relationship. But if we see that that is a false process leading to illusion, to limitation, to conflict, to separateness—ideas always separate—, then we will begin to understand relationship directly, and not impose upon relationship a prejudice, a condition. Then we will see that love is not a thought process. You cannot think about love. But most of us do, and so it is merely sensation. And, if we limit relationship to an idea based on sensation, then we discard love, then we fill our hearts with the things of the mind. Though we may feel the sensation and call it love, it is not love. Surely, love is something beyond the thought process, but it can be discovered only through understanding the thought process in relationship; not through denying the thought process, but through being aware of the whole significance of the ways of our mind and of our action in relationship. If we can proceed more deeply,

then we will see that action is not related to idea. Then action is from moment to moment; and in that experience, which is right meditation, there is immortality.

Question : What place has criticism in relationship? What is the difference between destructive and constructive criticism?

KRISHNAMURTI : First of all, why do we criticize? Is it in order to understand? Or is it merely a nagging process? If I criticize you, do I understand you? Does understanding come through judgment? If I want to comprehend, if I want to understand, not superficially but deeply, the whole significance of my relationship to you, do I begin to criticize you? Or, am I aware of this relationship between you and me, silently observing it—not projecting my opinions, criticisms, judgments, identifications, or condemnations, but silently observing what is happening? And, if I do not criticize, what happens? One is apt to go to sleep, is one not? Which does not man that we do not go to sleep if we are nagging. Perhaps that becomes a habit; and we put ourselves to sleep through habit. Is there a deeper, wider understanding of relationship, through criticism? It doesn't matter whether criticism is constructive or destructive—that is irrelevant, surely. Therefore, the question is: What is the necessary state of mind and heart that will understand relationship? What is the process of understanding? How do we understand something? How do you understand your child, if you are interested in your child? You observe, don't you? You watch him at play, you study him in his different moods; you don't project your opinion onto him. You don't say he should be this or that. You are alertly watchful, aren't you?, actively aware. Then, perhaps, you begin to understand the child. But if

you are constantly criticizing, constantly injecting your own particular personality, your idiosyncrasies, your opinions, deciding the way he should or should not be, and all the rest of it, obviously you create a barrier in that relationship. But, unfortunately, most of us criticize in order to shape, in order to interfere; and it gives us a certain amount of pleasure, a certain gratification, to shape something—your relationship with your husband, child, or whoever it be. You feel a sense of power in it, you are the boss; and in that there is a tremendous gratification. Surely, through all that process there is no understanding of relationship. There is mere imposition, the desire to mould another to the particular pattern of your idiosyncrasy, your desire, your wish. All these prevent, do they not?, the understanding of relationship.

Then, there is self-criticism. To be critical of oneself, to criticize, condemn, or justify oneself—does that bring understanding of oneself? When I begin to criticize myself, do I not limit the process of understanding, of exploring? Does introspection, a form of self-criticism, unfold the self? What makes the unfoldment of the self possible? To be constantly analytical, fearful, critical—surely, that does not help to unfold. What brings about the unfoldment of the self so that you begin to understand it, is the constant awareness of it without any condemnation, without any identification. There must be a certain spontaneity; you cannot be constantly analyzing it, disciplining it, shaping it. This spontaneity is essential to understanding. If I merely limit, control, condemn, then I put a stop to the movement of thought and feeling, do I not? It is in the movement of thought and feeling that I discover—not in mere control. And, when one discovers, then it is important to find out how to act about it. Now, if I act according to an idea, according to a standard, according to an ideal,

then I force the self into a particular pattern. In that there is no understanding, there is no transcending. But if I can watch the self without any condemnation, without any identification, then it is possible to go beyond it. That is why this whole process of approximating oneself to an ideal is so utterly wrong. Ideals are home-made gods; and to conform to a self-projected image, is surely not a release.

So, there can be understanding only when the mind is silently aware, observing—which is arduous, because we take delight in being active, in being restless, critical, in condemning, justifying. That is our whole structure of being; and through the screen of ideas, prejudices, points of view, experiences, memories, we try to understand. Is it possible to be free of all these screens, and so understand directly? Surely, we do that when the problem is very intense; we do not go through all these methods—we approach it directly. So, the understanding of relationship comes only when this process of self-criticism is understood, and the mind is quiet. If you are listening to me and are trying to follow, with not too great an effort, what I wish to convey, then there is a possibility of our understanding each other. But if you are all the time criticizing, throwing up your opinions, what you have learned from books, what somebody else has told you, and so on and so on, then you and I are not related, because this screen is between us. But if we are both trying to find out the issues of the problem, which lie in the problem itself, if both of us are eager to go to the bottom of it, find the truth of it, discover what it is—then we are related. Then your mind is both alert and passive, watching to see what is true in this. So, your mind must be extraordinarily swift, not anchored to any idea or ideal, to any judgment, to any opinion that you have consolidated through your particular experiences. Understanding comes, surely, when there is the

swift pliability of a mind which is passively aware. Then it is capable of reception, then it is sensitive. A mind is not sensitive when it is crowded with ideas, prejudices, opinions, either for or against.

So, to understand relationship there must be a passive awareness—which does not destroy relationship. On the contrary, it makes relationship much more vital, much more significant. Then there is in that relationship a possibility of real affection; there is a warmth, a sense of nearness, which is not mere sentiment or sensation. And if we can so approach or be in that relationship to everything, then our problems will be easily solved—the problems of property, the problems of possession. Because, we are that which we possess. The man who possesses money, is the money. The man who identifies himself with property, is the property, or the house, or the furniture. Similarly with ideas, or with people; and when there is possessiveness, there is no relationship. But most of us possess because we have nothing else, if we do not possess. We are empty shells if we do not possess, if we do not fill our life with furniture, with music, with knowledge, with this or that. And that shell makes a lot of noise, and that noise we call living; and with that we are satisfied. And when there is a disruption, a breaking away of that, then there is sorrow; because then you suddenly discover yourself as you are—an empty shell, without much meaning. So, to be aware of the whole content of relationship, is action; and from that action there is a possibility of true relationship, a possibility of discovering its great depth, its great significance, and of knowing what love is.

Question: When you speak of timelessness, it seems you must mean something besides a sequence of events. Time, to me, is necessary for action, and I cannot imagine

existence without a sequence of events. Do you perhaps mean that, by knowing what part of you is eternal, time no longer becomes a means to an end, or a means to progress?

KRISHNAMURTI: First of all, we cannot discuss what the timeless is. A mind that is the product of time cannot think of something which is timeless. Because, after all, my mind, your mind, is a result of the past; it is founded upon the past, its thought is the outcome of the past, which is time. And with that instrument, we try to think of something which is not of time; and that is not possible, surely. We can speculate upon it, we can write books about it, we can imagine it, do all kinds of tricks with it, but it will not be the real. So, do not let us speculate about it. Let us not even talk about it. To speculate what the timeless state is, is utterly useless, it has no meaning. But we can do something else, which is to find out how to make the mind free from its own past, from its own self-projection; we can find out what gives it continuity, a sequence of events as a means of progress, as a means of understanding, what you will. We can see that a thing which continues, must decay. That which has continuance, cannot renew itself. Only that which comes to an end, can renew. A mind that is merely caught in a habit, or in a particular opinion, or held in the net of ideals, beliefs, dogmas—for such a mind there can be no renewal, surely. It cannot look at life anew. It is only when those things are put aside, and it is free, that the mind can look at life anew. There is a renewal, a creative urge, only when the past has come to an end, which means, when there is no longer identification giving continuity as the me and the mine—my property, my home, my wife, my child, my ideal, my gods, my political opinions. It is this constant identification that gives continuity to the sequence of events as the me becoming wider, bigger,

nobler, more worthy, cleverer, and so on and so on.

Is life, existence, a matter of the sequence of events? What do we mean by sequence of events? Do I know that I am alive because I remember yesterday? Do I know that I am alive because I know the way to my house? Or do I know that I am alive because I am going to be somebody? How do I know that I am alive? It is only in the present, surely, that I know I am conscious. Is consciousness merely the result of the sequence of events? With most of us, it is—I know I am alive, I am conscious, because of my past, of my identification with something. Is it possible to know that one is conscious, without this process of identification? And, why does one identify? Why do I identify myself as my property, my name, my ambition, my progress? Why? And what would happen if we did not identify? Would it deny all existence? Perhaps, if we did not identify, there might be a wider field for action, a greater depth to feeling and to thought. We identify because it gives us the feeling of being alive as an entity, as a separate entity. So, the feeling that one is separate has become important because through separateness we enjoy the more; and if we deny separateness, we are afraid that we shall not be capable of enjoying, having pleasures. Surely, that is the basis of the desire for continuity, is it not? But there is also a collective process at work. Since separateness involves a great deal of destruction and so on, there is in opposition to that, collectivism, discarding the individual separateness. But the individual becomes the collective through another form of identification, and so retains his separateness—as we can see.

As long as there is continuity through identification, there can be no renewal. Only with the cessation of identification is there a possibility of renewal. And most of us are frightened of coming to an end. Most

of us are frightened of death. Innumerable books have been written about what is after death. We are more interested in death than in living. Because, with death, there seems to be an end, an end to identification. That which continues, surely, has no rebirth, no renewal. Only in dying is there renewal; and therefore it is important to die every minute—not wait to die of old age and disease. That means dying to all one's accumulations and identifications, one's gathered experiences; and that is real simplicity, not the accumulated continuance of identification.

So, when this process of identification—which revives memory and gives continuance to memory in the present—when that ceases, then there is a possibility of rebirth, renewal, creativeness; and in that renewal there is no continuity. That which renews cannot continue. It is from moment to moment.

The questioner asks also: "Do you perhaps mean that, by knowing what part of you is eternal, time no longer becomes a means to an end?" Is there a part of you that is eternal? That which you can think about is still the product of thought, and therefore not the eternal. Because, thought is the result of the past, of time. And if you posit a something eternal in you, you have already thought about it. I am not cleverly arguing this matter. You can see very well that the eternal is not what you can think about. You cannot progress to the eternal, you cannot evolve to it; if you do, it is merely a projection of thought, and therefore still within the net of time. That way leads to illusion, misery, to all the ugliness of deception—which we like; because the mind can function only within the known, from safety to safety, from security to security. The eternal is not, if it is within the bondage of time; and the moment the mind thinks about it, it is in the bondage of time, and therefore it is not real.

So, when you perceive this whole process of identification, when you see how thought gives continuity to things in order to be secure, how the thinker separates himself from the thought and thereby makes himself secure—when you see all this process of time and understand it, not merely verbally, but deeply feel it, inwardly experience it, then you will find that you no longer think of the timeless. Then the mind is quiet, not only superficially, but profoundly; then it becomes tranquil—is tranquil. Then there is a direct experience of that which is measureless. But merely to speculate upon what is the timeless, is a waste of time. You might just as well play poker. All speculation is brushed aside the moment you have a direct experience. And that is what we are discussing—how to have this direct experience, without the intervention of the mind. But when once there is this direct experiencing, the mind clings to the sensations of it, and then wants a repetition of that experience; which means, really, that the mind is interested in sensation, not in experiencing. Therefore, mind can never experience, it can only know sensations. The experiencing comes only when the mind is not the experiencer. So, the timeless cannot be known, or imagined, or experienced through the mind. And as that is the only instrument which we have cultivated, at the expense of everything else, we are lost when we look at the process of the mind. We must be lost. We must come to an end—which is not despair, not fear. Know the process of the mind, see what it is; and when you see what it is, it comes to an end, without any enforcement. Only then is there a possibility of that renewal which is eternal.

Question : Is there a gulf, an interval of any duration, between my perceiving something, and being or realizing it? Does not this interval imply an ideal at one end, and its

realization at the other, through practice and technique? It is this 'how' or the method that we want from you.

KRISHNAMURTI: Is there an interval between perception and action? Most of us would say yes. We say there is an interval: I see, and later on I will act. I understand intellectually, but how am I to put it into practice? I see what you mean, but I don't know how to carry it out. This gap, this gulf, this interval, is it necessary? Or, are we only deceiving ourselves? When I say, 'I see', I really don't see. If I do see, then there is no problem. If I see something, action follows. If I see a poisonous snake, I don't say, 'I see, and how am I to act?' I act. But we don't see; and we don't see, because we don't want to see; because it is too imminent, too dangerous, too vital. To see would upset our whole process of thinking, living. Therefore, we say, 'I see, and please tell me how to act'. Therefore you are interested in the method, the 'how' to do it, the practice. So we say, 'I see the idea, I comprehend, but how am I to act?' Then we try to bridge, to connect the action with the idea, and we get lost. Then we search for methods. You go to various teachers, psychologists, *gurus*, or what you will, and you join societies that will help you to bridge the action with the idea. That is a very convenient way of living, a happy escape, a very respectable way of avoiding action. And, in that process, we are all caught. I realize I must be virtuous, I must not be angry, mean—but please tell me how to do it. And this process of 'how to do it' becomes a religious investment, an exploitation, and all the rest of it follows—vast properties, you know, the whole game of it. In other words, we don't see, and we don't want to see. But we don't say that honestly. The moment we admit that, we have to act. Then we know we are deceiving ourselves, and it is very un-

pleasant. So we say, 'Please, I am gradually learning, I am still weak, I am not strong enough, it is a matter of progress, evolution, growth; eventually I will get there'. So, we should never say that we see, or perceive, or understand; because mere verbalization has no significance. There is no gap between seeing and acting. The moment you see, you act. You do that when you are driving a car. If you did not, there would be danger. But we have invented so many ways of avoiding. We have become so clever, so cunning, as not to change radically. But there is no gap between perception and action. When you see a poisonous snake, how quickly you respond; the action is instantaneous. When there is a gap, it indicates sluggishness of the mind, laziness, avoidance. And that avoidance, that laziness, becomes very respectable, because all of us are doing it. So, you look for a method to bridge the idea with the action, and so you live in illusion. And perhaps you may like it. But for a man who actually perceives, there is no problem; there is action. We do not perceive because of our innumerable prejudices, our disinclination, our laziness, our hopes that something will alter it.

So, to think in terms of idea separate from action is obviously ignorant. To say, 'I will be something'—the Buddha, the Master, what you will—is obviously a wrong process. What is important is to understand what you are now; and that cannot be understood if you are postponing, if you have an interval between the ideal and yourself. And as most of us indulge in that particular form of excitement, obviously you will pay scant attention to all this. Ideas can never free action. On the contrary, ideas limit action; and there is action only when I understand as I go along, from moment to moment, not tethered to particular beliefs, or to a particular ideal which I am going to realize. That is to die from moment to moment, in which there is rene-

wal. And that renewal will answer the next problem. That renewal gives a new light, a new significance to everything. And there can be renewal only when there is freedom from the gap, from the gulf, from the interval, between idea and action.

Question : You often speak of living, experiencing, and yet being as nothing. What is this state of consciously being as nothing? Has this anything to do with humility, being open to the grace of God?

KRISHNAMURTI: To be consciously anything, is not to be free. If I am conscious that I am non-greedy, beyond anger, surely I am not free from greed, anger. Humility is something of which you cannot be conscious. To cultivate humility, is to cultivate self-expansion negatively. Therefore, any virtue that is deliberately cultivated, practised, lived, is obviously not virtue. It is a form of resistance; it is a form of self-expansion, which has its own gratification. But it is no longer virtue. Virtue is merely a freedom in which you discover the real. Without virtue, there can be no freedom. Virtue is not an end in itself. Now, it is not possible, by deliberate, conscious effort, to be as nothing, because then, it is another achievement. Innocence is not the result of careful cultivation. To be as nothing, is essential. As a cup is useful only when it is empty, so only when one is as nothing, is it possible to receive the grace of God, or truth, or what you will. Is it possible to be nothing in the sense of arriving at it? Can you achieve it? As you have built a house, or gathered money, can you get this also? To sit down and meditate about nothingness, consciously throwing out everything, making yourself receptive, surely, is a form of resistance, isn't it? That is a deliberate action of the will, and will is desire; and when you desire to be nothing, you are something already. Please, see the

importance of this: When you desire positive things, you know what it implies—struggle, pain; and so you reject them, and you say to yourself, 'Now I will be nothing'. The desire is still the same, it is the same process in another direction. The will to be nothing, is as the will to be something. So, the problem is not to be nothing, or to be something, but to understand the whole process of desire: craving to be, or not to be. In that process the entity that desires is different from desire. You don't say, 'Desire is me', but, 'I am desirous of something'. Therefore, there is a separation between the experiencer, the thinker, and the experience, the thought. Don't, please, make this metaphysical and difficult. You can look at it very simply—simply, in the sense that one can feel one's way into it.

So, as long as there is the desire to be nothing, you are something. And that desire to be something divides you as the experiencer and the experience; and in that condition, there is no possibility of experiencing. Because, in the state of experiencing, there is neither the experiencer nor the experience. When you are experiencing something, you aren't thinking that you are experiencing. When you are really happy, you don't say, 'I am happy'. The moment you say it, it is gone. So, our problem is not how to be nothing, which is really quite childish, or how to learn a new jargon and try to become that jargon, but how to understand the whole process of desire, craving. And it is so subtle, so complex, that you must approach it very simply—not with all the conflicts of condemnation, justification, what it should be, what it should not be, how it must be destroyed, how it must be sublimated—all of which you have learned from books, from religious organizations. If we can discard all that, and merely silently observe the process of desire, which is oneself—which is not, you experience desire, but experiencing desire—, then we will see that there

is a freedom from this burning, constant urge to be or not to be, to become, to gain, to be the Master, to have virtue, and all the idiocy of desire and its pursuits. Then there can be a direct experiencing, that is, experiencing without the observer. Then only is there a possibility of being completely open, of being as nothing; and then there is the reception of the real.

August 14, 1949.

XI

We have been discussing, for the past several weeks, the problem of understanding oneself. Because, the more one thinks about the many conflicting and ever-increasing problems of life, private and social, the more one sees that, unless there is a fundamental, radical transformation within oneself, obviously it is not possible to deal with those problems that confront each one of us. So, it is essential, is it not ?, if one is to resolve any of these problems of our life, to tackle them oneself directly, to be in relationship with them, and not merely rely on specialists, experts, religious leaders, or political givers of panaceas. And, as our life, our culture and civilization, are getting more and more complicated, it is becoming correspondingly difficult to deal with the ever-increasing problems directly.

Now, it seems to me that one of the problems, amongst others, which most of us have not very deeply and fundamentally faced, is the question of domination and submission. And, if I may, I would like to discuss this double-sided nature of domination rather briefly and succinctly before I answer the questions. Why is it that we dominate, consciously or unconsciously—the man and the woman, the woman and the man, and so on ? There is domination in different ways, not only in private life, but the whole tendency of governments

is also to dominate. Why is this spirit of domination going on constantly, from period to period ? Only very few seem to escape it. Can we think of it in a different sense ? That is, can we understand it without going to the opposite ? Because, the moment we recognize it, the moment we are aware of this problem of domination, we at once begin to submit, or we think of it in terms of the opposite, submission. Can we not think without the opposite, and look at the problem directly ? Perhaps we shall then be able to understand this whole complex problem of domination, seeking power over another, or submitting oneself to another. After all, submission is another form of domination. To submit oneself to another, whether it be to a man or to a woman, is the negative form of domination. By the very denial of domination, one becomes submissive ; and I do not think we shall be able to solve this problem by thinking in terms of the opposite. So, let us go into it, and see why it exists.

First of all, one must be aware, must one not ?, of the obvious, crude form of domination. Most of us are aware of it, if we are at all alert. But there is the unconscious domination, of which most of us are unaware. That is, this unconscious desire to dominate takes the guise or the cloak of service, of love, of being kind, and so on. The unconscious desire to dominate exists under different forms ; and I think it is much more important to understand this fact, than merely to try to regulate the superficial domination of one by another.

Now, why is it that we unconsciously want to dominate ? Probably most of us are unaware that we dominate at different levels—not only in the family, but at the verbal level as well ; and also there is this inward desire to seek power, to seek success, which are all indications of domination. Why ? Why do we want to dominate another ? Or, be subservient to another ? If one delibera-

tely, consciously, put that question to oneself, what would be the response? Most of us wouldn't know why we want to dominate. First of all, there is in it the sensation, the unconscious pleasure of dominating somebody. Is that the only motive which makes us want to dominate? Surely, that is part of it; but there is much more to it, a much deeper significance. I wonder if you have ever watched yourself dominating in relationship, either as the man or as the woman? And if you have been conscious of it, what has been your response, your reaction? And why shouldn't we dominate? In relationship, which is life, do we understand through domination? In relationship, if I dominate you or you dominate me, do we understand each other? After all, that is life, isn't it? Relationship is life, relationship is action; and if I merely live in the self-enclosing action of domination, is there any relationship? Is not domination a process of isolation, which denies relationship? Is not domination a process of separation which destroys relationship? And is this really what I am seeking? And can there be relationship between two people, if there is any sense of domination or submission? Life is relationship—one cannot live in isolation. But, is not our purpose unconsciously to isolate ourselves within the cloak, within that feeling of aggressive assertiveness which is domination?

So, is not the process of domineering a process of isolation, and isn't this what most of us want? Most of us sedulously cultivate it. Because, to be open in relationship is very painful, it needs extraordinary intelligence and adaptability, quickness, understanding; and when that is not, we try to isolate ourselves. And is not the process of domination, a process of isolation? Obviously, it is. It is a process of self-enclosure. And when I am enclosed, encased in my own opinion, my own desires, my own ambitions, my urge to dominate, am I related? And if there is no

relationship, how is any real existence possible? Is there not constant friction, and therefore sorrow? So, our unconscious desire in relationship is not to be hurt, to seek security, refuge; and when that is thwarted, there is no fulfilment. Then I begin to isolate myself. And one of the processes of isolation is domination. And that fear which leads to isolation takes another form also, does it not? There is not only the desire to assert, to dominate, or be submissive, but there is also in this process of isolation the consciousness of being alone, of being lonely. After all, most of us are lonely—I won't use the word 'alone', for that has a different sense. Most of us are isolated, we live in our own world, though we may be related; though we may be married and have children, we live in a world of our own. And that is a very lonely world. It is a sorrowful world, with an occasional opening of joy and amusement, happiness, and so on; but it is a solitary world. And, to escape from that, we try to be something, we try to assert, we try to dominate. And hence, in order to escape from what we are, domination becomes a means through which we can take flight from ourselves.

So, does not this whole process of domination take place not only when there is the desire to avoid facing that which we are, but also when there is a desire to be isolated? If we can look at this process in ourselves, not in any condemnatory spirit, which is merely taking the opposite side, but to understand why we have this extraordinary desire to dominate, or to become very subservient; if we can be aware of it without any sense of taking the opposite side, I think we will really experience that state of isolation from which we are trying to run away; and then we shall be able to solve it. That is, if we understand something, we are free of it. It is only when we do not understand, that there is fear.

So, can we look at this :

without condemnation? Can we merely observe, silently watch this process at work within ourselves? It can be observed very easily in all our relationships. Just silently watch the whole phenomenon unfold itself. You will find that when there is no condemnation, no justification for your domination, it begins to unfold, there is no hindrance; then you will begin to see all the implications, not only of personal domination, but also of public domination, the domination of one group by another, of one country by another, of one ideology by another, and so on. Self-knowledge is essential for any kind of understanding. And as our relationship is life—without relationship there can be no existence—if you approach it rightly you begin to see this process of domination expressing itself in so many ways; and when you understand this whole process, conscious as well as unconscious, there is a freedom from it. Surely, there must be freedom; and only then is there a possibility of going beyond. Because, a mind that is merely dominating, asserting, tethered to a particular form of belief, to a particular opinion, cannot go further, cannot take a long journey, cannot soar. And so, is it not essential, in understanding oneself, to understand this most difficult and complex problem of domination? It takes such subtle forms; and when it takes a righteous form, it becomes very obstinate. The desire to serve, with the unconscious desire to dominate, is much more difficult to deal with. Can there be love when there is domination? Can you be in relationship to someone whom you say you love, and yet dominate? Then, surely, you are merely using; and when there is using, there is no relationship, is there?

So, to understand this problem, one has to be sensitive to the whole question of domination. Not that you should not dominate, or be submissive; but there should be aware-

ness of this whole problem. To be aware, one must approach it without any condemnation, not taking sides; and it is a very difficult thing to do, because most of us are swayed to condemn. And we condemn because we think we understand. We don't. The moment we condemn, we stop understanding. That is one of the easiest ways of brushing things aside—to condemn somebody. But to understand this whole process requires great alertness of mind; and a mind is not alert when it is condemning, or justifying, or merely identifying itself with what it feels.

So, self-knowledge is a constant discovery from moment to moment; but that discovery is denied if the past throws up an opinion, a barrier; the cumulative action of the mind prevents immediate understanding.

I have several questions; but, before I answer them, may I say that those of you who are taking notes, should not do so. I will explain why: I am talking to an individual, to you, not to a group. You and I together are experiencing something. You are not taking notes of what I am saying, you are experiencing. We are going together on a journey; and if you are merely concerned with taking notes, you are not really listening. You take it down in order to think it over, you will say, or in order to tell some of your friends who are not here. But, surely, that is not important, is it? What is important is that you and I understand; and to understand, you must give your full attention. And how can you give your full attention when you are taking notes? Please, see the importance of this, and then you will naturally abstain from taking notes. You don't have to be compelled, you don't have to be told. Because, what is important in these meetings is not so much the words, but the content behind, the psychological implications; and you cannot understand those unless you give your full attention, your conscious attention.

Question : Is not the experience of the past a help towards freedom and right action in the present ? Cannot knowledge be a liberating factor, and not a hindrance ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Do we understand the present through the past ? Do we understand something through the accumulation of experiences ? What do we mean by knowledge ? What do we mean by the accumulation of experiences which you say gives you understanding ? What do we mean by all that ? And what do we mean by past experience ? Let's go into it a little bit, because it is very important to find out whether the past which is the accumulation of your memories of incidents, of experiences, will give you understanding of an experience in the present.

Now, what happens when there is an experience ? What is the process of it ? What is an experience ? A challenge and a response, is it not ? That is what we call experience. Now, the challenge must always be new, otherwise it is not a challenge ; and do I meet it adequately, fully, completely, if I respond according to my past conditioning ? Do I understand it ? After all, life is a process of challenge and response. That is the constant process. And there is friction between challenge and response when the response is inadequate—there is sorrow, pain. When the response is equal to the challenge, then there is harmony ; then there is integration between challenge and response. Now, can my response to a challenge, if it is based on the various experiences of the past, can such a response be adequate ? Can it meet the challenge on the same level ? And what is the response ? The response is the outcome of the accumulation of various experiences—the memory, the sensation of various experiences; not the experience itself, but the memory and the sensation of the experience. Therefore, it is sensation which meets the challenge, it is memory which meets the challenge.

That is what we call accumulated knowledge, isn't it ? Therefore, knowledge is always the known, the past, the conditioned ; the conditioned meets the unconditioned, the challenge, and therefore there is no relationship between the two ; then you translate the challenge according to the conditioned mind, conditioned responses. And is that not a hindrance ?

So, how to meet the challenge adequately is the question. If I meet it with my past experiences, I can see very well that it is not adequate. And my mind is the past; my thought is the result of the past. So, can thought meet the challenge—thought, the outcome of knowledge, the result of various experiences, and so on ? Can thought meet the challenge ? As thought is conditioned, how can it meet it ? It can meet it partially, therefore inadequately—and therefore there is friction, pain, and all the rest of it. So, there is a different way of meeting the challenge, is there not ? And what is that way, that process ? That is what is implied in this question.

First of all, one must see that the challenge is always new ; it must be new, otherwise it is not a challenge. A problem is always a new problem, because it is varying from moment to moment ; and if it does not, it is not a problem. It is static. So, if the challenge is new, the mind must be new ; it must come to it afresh, and not burdened by the past. But the mind is the past ; therefore, the mind must be silent. We do this instinctively, almost without thought, when the problem is very great ; when the problem is really new, the mind is silent. It is no longer chattering, no longer burdened by accumulated knowledge. Then, with that newness it responds, and therefore there is a comprehension of the challenge. Surely, that is how all creativeness takes place. Creation, or that sense of creativeness, is from moment to moment, it has no accumulation. You may have the technique for the ex-

pression of that creativeness; but that sense of creativeness comes into being only when the mind is absolutely quiet, no longer burdened by the past, by the innumerable experiences, the sensations it has gathered.

So, the adequacy of the response to the challenge depends, not on knowledge, not on previous memories, but on its newness, freshness; and that freshness is denied, that quality of renewal is denied, when there is a continuity of accumulated experience. Therefore, there must be an ending to each minute, a death to each minute.

Please, perhaps some of you may feel that it is all very well to talk like this; but if you really experiment with it, you will see how extraordinarily, how quickly one understands the challenge, how profoundly one is related to the challenge, and not merely responding to it. Surely, one understands only when the mind is capable of renewing itself, being new, fresh—not 'open'. Then it is like a sieve. And as the problem is always new—sorrow is always new, if it is real sorrow, not merely the memory of something else—you must understand it, approach it afresh, you must have a fresh mind. And therefore, knowledge as the accumulation of experiences, individual or collective, such knowledge is an impediment to understanding.

Question: Is my believing in the now well-authenticated fact of survival after death a hindrance to liberation through self-knowledge? Is it not essential to distinguish between belief based on objective evidence, and belief arising from inner psychological states?

KRISHNAMURTI: Surely, what is important is, not whether there is or is not continuity after death, but why we believe. What is the psychological state that demands belief in something? Please let us be very

clear. We are not disputing now whether there is or is not life after death. That is another question, and we shall deal with it afterwards, another time. But the question is, what is the compulsion in me, the psychological necessity, to believe? A fact does not demand a belief on your part, surely. The sun sets, the sun rises—that does not demand a belief. Belief arises only when you want to translate the fact according to your desires, to your psychological states, to suit your particular prejudices, vanities, idiosyncrasies. So, what is important is, how you approach the fact—whether it is the fact of life after death, or any other fact. So, the question is, not whether there is survival of the individual after death, after his body dies, but why you believe; what is the psychological urge to believe? Surely, that is clear, is it not? So, let us investigate whether that psychological belief is not a hindrance to understanding.

If one is confronted with a fact, there is nothing more to be said about it. It is a fact, the sun sets. But, the problem is why there is this incessant urge in me to believe in something—to believe in God, to believe in an ideology, to believe in a future Utopia, to believe in something or other. Why? Why do we believe? Why is there this psychological urge to believe? What would happen if we did not believe, if we merely looked at facts? Can we? It becomes almost impossible, does it not?, because we want to translate facts according to our sensations. So, beliefs become sensations, which intervene between the fact and myself. So, belief becomes a hindrance. Are we different from our beliefs? You believe that you are an American, or that you are a Hindu, you believe in this and that, in reincarnation—in dozens of things. You are that, are you not? You are what you believe. And why do you believe? Which doesn't mean that I am being atheistic, or denying God, and all that stupidity—we are not discussing

that. Reality has nothing to do with belief.

So, the problem is, why do you believe? Why the psychological necessity, the investment in belief? Is it not because, without belief you are nothing? Without the passport of belief, what are you? Without labelling yourself as something, what are you? If you do not believe in reincarnation, if you do not call yourself this or that, if you have no labels, what are you? Therefore, belief acts as a label, an identifying card; and remove the card, where are you? Is it not that basic fear, that sense of being lost, which necessitates belief? Please, think it over, don't reject it. Let us experience together the things that we are talking about, not merely listen, then go away and carry on with our usual beliefs and non-beliefs. We are discussing the whole problem of belief.

So, belief, the word, has become important. The label has become important. If I did not call myself a Hindu, with all its implications, I would be lost, I would have no identity. But to identify myself with India, as a Hindu, gives me tremendous prestige; it places me, it fixes me, it gives me value. So, belief becomes a necessity when I am psychologically aware, whether consciously or unconsciously, that without the label, I am lost. Then the label becomes important—not what I am, but the label: Christian, Buddhist, Hindu. And we try then to live according to those beliefs, which are self-projected, therefore unreal. Surely, the man who believes in God, his God is a self-projected God, a home-made God; but the man who does not believe in God is still the same. To understand what that is, that supreme something, one must come to it afresh, anew, not tethered to a belief. And I think that is our difficulty—socially, economically, politically, and in our individual relationships—that is, we approach all these problems with a prejudice; and as the problems are vital, living, they

can be met adequately only when the mind is new, not tethered to some self-projected, home-made belief.

So, belief becomes a hindrance, obviously, when the desire for belief is not understood; and when it is understood, there is no question of belief. Then you are able to face facts as they are. But even if there is continuity after death, does it solve the problem of living in the present? If I know that I am going to live after this thing dies, have I understood life?—which is now, not tomorrow. And to understand the present, do I have to believe? Surely, to understand the present, which is living, which is not merely a period of time, I must have a mind that is capable of meeting that present completely, giving it full attention. But if my attention is distracted by a belief, surely there is no meeting of the present completely, fully.

So, belief becomes a hindrance to the understanding of reality. As reality is the unknown, and belief is the known, how can the known meet the unknown? But our difficulty is, we want the unknown with the known. We don't want to let go the known, because it is too frightening, there is great insecurity, uncertainty; and that is why, to safeguard ourselves, we hedge ourselves about with beliefs. It is only in the state of uncertainty, insecurity, in which there is no sense of refuge, that you discover. That is why you must be lost in order to find. But we don't want to be lost. And to prevent ourselves from getting lost, we have home-made beliefs and gods to protect us. And when the moment of real crisis comes, these gods and beliefs have no value; and hence beliefs are an impediment to him who really wants to discover what is.

Question: Why is it that, in spite of all you have said against authority, certain individuals identify themselves with you or with your state of being, and thereby gain authority?

for themselves? How can the inexperienced prevent themselves from being caught in the net of these individuals? (Laughter).

KRISHNAMURTI: Sir, this is quite an important question, because it brings up the matter of our desire to identify ourselves with something. First of all, why do you want to identify yourself with me, or with my state of being, or whatever it is? How do you know it? Because I happen to talk, or happen to have a name? Surely, you are identifying yourself with something which you have projected. You are not identifying yourself with something that is alive. You are identifying yourself with something which is self-created, and you give it a label; and that label happens to be well-known, or known to a few; and this identification gives you prestige. And then you can exploit people. You know, by calling yourself a friend of somebody, or a disciple of somebody, you gain a reflected glory. You go all the way to India to find your god, or your Master, and then identify yourself with that particular cult or that particular idea, and it gives you a certain boost. And then you can exploit the people around you. It is such a stupid process. It gives you a sense of authority, of power, to think that you are the one person that understands; everybody else doesn't understand; you are the nearest disciple—you know, the various forms which we use in order to exploit the blind.

So, the first thing to understand is the desire to exploit people, which means the desire to have for yourself power, position, prestige. And as everybody wants that, the inexperienced as well as the experienced, everybody is caught mutually in the net. We all want to exploit somebody. We don't put it so brutally, but cover it up with soft words. As all of us depend on others, not only for our physical necessities, but also for our psychological necessities, we

all use others. If I used you in order to express myself at these meetings, you would like it much more; and I would feel gratified and we would be mutually exploiting each other, surely. But such a process denies a search for truth, the search for reality. You cannot prevent the inexperienced from being caught in the net of these individuals who claim they understand, who are the 'nearest'. Sir, perhaps you yourself may be caught in it; because we do not want to be free from all identification. Surely, truth has nothing to do with any individual; it does not depend on the interpretation of any individual. You have to experience it directly, not through somebody; and it is not a matter of sensation, not a matter of belief. But if we are caught in sensation and belief, then we will use others. So, if one is really seeking truth, honestly, directly, then there is no question of exploiting anybody. But that requires a great deal of honesty; that entails an aloneness, which can be understood only when one has been through loneliness, and has gone into it fully, completely. And as most of us do not want to go through the pain, the sorrow, of facing the complications of our psychological states, we are distracted by these exploiters; and we like to be exploited. It requires a great deal of patient awareness, of freedom from identification with anything, to understand, to grasp the whole significance of reality.

August 20, 1949.

XII

I do not know with what attitude one listens to these talks. I am afraid one is apt to listen to them with the intention of developing a method, a technique, a way; and I think it is very important to understand that tendency; because, if we are caught in a technique, in a way, in a method,

we shall lose entirely the creative release. That is, through the cultivation of a technique, of a method, we shall lose creativeness. And I would like to discuss this morning, what are the implications in the cultivation of a technique, a method, a way, and how it dulls the mind, not only at the verbal level, but at the deeper psychological levels. Because, most of us are uncreative. We may paint a little, write a poem or two occasionally, or on rare occasions enjoy beautiful scenery; but for the most part our minds are so caught in the way, in habit, which is a form of technique, that we do not seem to be able to go beyond. The problems of life do not demand a method, because they are so vital, they are so alive, that if we approach any one of them with a fixed pattern, a method, a way, we shall totally misunderstand, we shall not adequately meet that problem. And, most of us want a technique, a method; because the problem, the movement of life, is so alive, so vital, so swift, that our minds are incapable of meeting it rapidly, swiftly, with clarity; and we think that we shall be able to meet it, if we know how to meet it. So, we try to learn from another the how, the method, the technique, the way, the means.

I am not at all sure that most of us here are not concerned with the means. Don't deny it, because it is extremely difficult to be free from the desire for a technique in order to achieve. Because, when we have a means, we emphasize the end, the result. We are more concerned with the result than with the understanding of the problem itself, whatever the outcome may be. Why is it that most of us seek a method for happiness, for the right way of thinking, for peace of mind or peace of soul, or whatever it is?

First of all, we carry over the mentality of industrial technology to meet life. That is, we want to meet life efficiently; and to meet it efficiently, we think we need a method;

and most religious societies, most teachers, offer a method: how to be peaceful, how to be happy, how to have a tranquil mind, how to concentrate, and so on, and so on. Now where there is efficiency, there is ruthlessness; and the more you are efficient, the more intolerant, the more enclosed, the more resistant you are. This gradually develops the sense of pride; and pride, obviously, is isolating, it is destructive to understanding. We admire efficient people; and governments throughout the world are concerned with the cultivation of efficiency and the organization of efficiency: efficiency to produce, to kill, to carry out the ideology of a party, of a church, or of a particular religion. We all want to be efficient, and thereby we cultivate the psychological demand for a pattern to which we will conform in order to achieve efficiency. Efficiency, which means the cultivation of a technique, of a method, implies the constant practice of a habit, psychologically. We know about the industrial habits, but very little about the psychological habit of resistance. And I am not at all sure that that is not what most of us are seeking: the cultivation of a habit which will make us efficient to meet life, which is so swift. So, if we can understand, not only at the verbal level, but at the deeper, psychological levels, this whole process of the cultivation of technique, method, means, then we shall be able to understand, I think, what it is to be creative. Because, when there is the creative urge, it will find its own technique or its own means of expression. But if we are consumed, taken up, with the cultivation of a technique, obviously we shall never find the other. And why is it that we want technique, the psychological pattern of action which gives us certainty, efficiency, a continuity, a sustained effort? After all, if you must read religious books, most of them, I am pretty sure—not that I have read any of them—ⁱⁿ the way. The way becomes

because the way points the goal; therefore, the goal is separate from the way. Is that so? Is the means different from the end? If, psychologically, you cultivate a habit, a method, a means, a way, a technique, is not the end already projected, already crystallized? Therefore, the means and the end are not separate. That is, you cannot have peace in the world through violent methods, at whatever level. The means and the end are inseparable; and a mind that cultivates a habit will create the end which is already foreseen, already cultivated, already existent, projected by the mind. And that is what most of us want. The technique is only the cultivation of the known, of security, of certainty; and with the known the mind wants to perceive the unknown; therefore, it can never understand it. So, the means matters, not the end; because the end and the means are one. So, the mind which cultivates habit, way, technique, prevents creativeness, that extraordinary sense of spontaneous discovery.

Our problem, then, is not to cultivate a new technique, a new habit, or to discover a new way, but to be altogether free of the psychological search for a technique. If you have something to say, you will say it, the right words will come out. But if you have nothing to say, and you cultivate a marvellous eloquence, you know, go to schools to learn how to speak, then what you project, what you say, will have very little meaning.

So, why is it that most of us are seeking a method, a technique? Obviously, we want to be sure, to be certain not to go wrong; we do not want to experiment, to discover. The practice of a technique prevents discovery from moment to moment; because truth, or what you will, is from moment to moment, it is not a continuous, increasing, growing arc. So, can we be free from the psychological urge to be sure, to cultivate a habit; a practice? These are all

resistance's, defences, and with this defensive mechanism, we want to understand something which is vital, swift. Now, if we can see that, see the implications in the cultivation or the search for a means, if we can see its psychological significance—not merely the superficial or industrial significance, which is obvious; if we can understand it fully, as I am explaining it and as you and I are experimenting with it, then perhaps we can discover what it means to be free of it. And, is it possible to be free from the desire to be secure psychologically? Technique, a means, offers security. You run in a groove, and then there is no going right or wrong; you are merely functioning automatically. Is it possible for a mind which has been trained for centuries to cultivate habit, a means—is it possible for such a mind to be free? It is possible only when we realize the whole significance of habit, the total process of its momentum. That is, as I am talking about it, silently observe your own process, be aware of the cumulative effect of all your desires to succeed, to gain, to achieve, which denies understanding. Because, the understanding of life, of this total process, does not come through desire—there must be a spontaneous meeting with it. If one can see this whole psychological process, as well as its outward expression—how all the governments, all society, all the various communities demand efficiency with all its ruthlessness—, then perhaps the mind will begin to break away from its accustomed habits. Then it will really be free, no longer seeking a means. Then, when the mind is quiet, there comes that creative something, which is creation itself. It will find its own expression, you don't have to choose an expression for it. If you are a painter, you will paint. It is that creative understanding that is vital, that gives grace, that gives happiness—not the technical expression of something which you have learnt.

So, reality, or God, or what you

will, is something that cannot come through a technique, through a means, through long determined practice and discipline. It is not a course laid out, with a known end. One must enter the uncharted sea. There must be an aloneness. Aloneness implies no means. You are not alone when you have a means. There must be complete nakedness, emptiness of all these accumulated practices, hopes, pleasures, desires for security—which are all consistently maintaining a means, a method, a technique. Then only is there the other, and then the problem is solved. A man who is dying from moment to moment, and therefore renewing, is able to meet life. It is not that he is separate from life; he is life.

Question : How can one be aware of an emotion without naming or labelling it? If I am aware of a feeling, I seem to know what that feeling is, almost immediately after it arises. Or, do you mean something different when you say, 'do not name'?

KRISHNAMURTI: This is a very difficult problem, and it requires a great deal of thinking, being aware of the whole content of it; and as I explain it, I hope you will follow, not merely verbally, but through experiencing it. I feel, if we can understand this question fully, deeply, we shall have understood a great deal. I shall try to approach it from different directions, if I can in the given time, because it is a very intricate and subtle problem. It requires all your attention, because you are experiencing what we are discussing, not merely listening and trying to experience it afterwards. There is no afterwards: either you experience now, always now, or never.

Now, why do we name anything? Why do we give a label to a flower, to a person, to a feeling? Either to

communicate one's feeling, to describe the flower, and so on, and so on; or, to identify oneself with that feeling. Isn't it? I name something, a feeling, to communicate it. 'I am angry'. Or, I identify myself with that feeling in order to strengthen it, to dissolve it, or to do something about it. That is, we give a name to something, to a rose, to communicate it to others; or, by giving it a name, we think we have understood it. We say, 'That is a rose', rapidly look at it, and go on. By giving it a name, we think we have understood it; we have classified it, and think that thereby we have understood the whole content and the beauty of that flower.

Now, when not merely to communicate, what happens when we give a name to a flower, to anything? Please follow it, think it out with me. Though I may talk aloud, you also are participating in the talking. By giving a name to something, we have merely put it into a category, and we think we have understood it; we don't look at it more closely. But, if we do not give it a name, we are forced to look at it. That is, we approach the flower, or whatever it is, with a newness, with a new quality of examination; we look at it as though we had never looked at it before. Naming is a very convenient way of disposing of people—by saying they are Germans, they are Japanese, they are Americans, they are Hindus, you know; give them a label, and destroy the label. But if you do not give a label to people, you are forced to look at them, and then it is much more difficult to kill somebody. You can destroy the label with a bomb, and feel righteous. But if you do not give a label, and must therefore look at the individual thing—whether it is a man, or a flower, or an incident, or an emotion—then you are forced to consider your relationship with it, and the action following. So, terming, or giving a label, is a very convenient way of disposing of anything, of denying, condemning, or justifying.

ing it. That is one side of the question.

Then, what is the core from which you name, what is the center which is always naming, choosing, labelling? We all feel there is a center, a core, do we not ?, from which we are acting, from which we are judging, from which we are naming. What is that center, that core ? Some would like to think it is a spiritual essence, God, or what you will. So, let us find out what is that core, that center, which is naming, terming, judging. Surely, that core is memory, isn't it ? A series of sensations, identified and enclosed—the past, given life through the present. That core, that center, feeds on the present through naming, labelling, remembering. I hope you are following this. We will see presently, as we unfold it, that as long as this center, this core exists, there can be no understanding. It is only with the dissolution of this core that there is understanding. Because, after all, that core is memory; memory of various experiences, which have been given names, labels, identifications. With those named and labelled experiences, from that center, there is acceptance and rejection, determination to be or not to be, according to the sensations, pleasures, and pains of the memory of experience. So, that center is the word. If you do not name that center, is there a center ? That is, if you do not think in terms of words, if you do not use words, can you think ? Thinking comes into being through verbalization ; or, verbalization begins to respond to thinking. So, the center, the core is the memory of innumerable experiences of pleasure and pain, verbalized. Watch it in yourself, please, and you will see that words have become much more important, labels have become much more important, than the substance ; and we live on words. Please, don't deny it, don't say it is right or wrong. We are exploring. If you merely explore one side of a thing, or stay put in

one place, you won't understand the whole content of it. Therefore, let us approach it from different angles.

For us, words like truth, God, have become very important—or the feeling which those words represent. When we say the word 'American', 'Christian', 'Hindu', or the word 'anger'—we are the word representing the feeling. But we don't know what that feeling is, because the word has become important. When you call yourself a Buddhist, a Christian, what does the word mean, what is the meaning behind that word which you have never examined ? Our center, the core is the word, the label. If the label does not matter, if what matters is that which is behind the label, then you are able to inquire ; but if you are identified with the label and stuck with it, you cannot proceed. And we are identified with the label : the house, the form, the name, the furniture, the bank account, our opinions, our stimulants, and so on, and so on. We are all those things—those things being represented by a name. The things have become important, the names, the labels ; and therefore the center, the core is the word.

Now, If there is no word, no label, there is no center, is there ? There is a dissolution, there is an emptiness—not the emptiness of fear, which is quite a different thing. There is a sense of being as nothing ; and because you have removed all the labels, or rather, because you have understood why you give labels to feelings and ideas, you are completely new, are you not ? There is no center from which you are acting. The center, which is the word, has been dissolved. The label has been taken away ; and where are you as the center ? You are there, but there has been a transformation. And that transformation is a little bit frightening ; therefore, you do not proceed with what is still involved in it ; you are already beginning to judge it, to decide whether you like

or don't like it. You don't proceed with the understanding of what is coming, but you are already judging; which means that you have a center from which you are acting. Therefore, you stay fixed the moment you judge; the words 'like' and 'dislike' become important. But what happens when you do not name? You look at emotion, at sensation, more directly, and therefore have quite a different relationship to it, just as you have to a flower when you do not name it. You are forced to look at it anew. When you do not name a group of people, you are compelled to look at each individual face, and not treat them all as the mass. Therefore, you are much more alert, much more observing, more understanding, you have a deeper sense of pity, love; but if you treat them all as the mass, it is over.

If you do not label, you have to regard every feeling as it arises. Now, when you label, is the feeling different from the label? Or, does the label awaken the feeling? Please, think it over. When we label, most of us intensify the feeling. The feeling and the naming are instantaneous. If there were a gap between naming and feeling, then you could find out if the feeling is different from the naming; and then you would be able to deal with the feeling without naming it. Is this all becoming rather too difficult? I'm glad. I'm afraid it should be difficult. (Laughter)

The problem is this, is it not?, how to be free from a feeling which we term, such as anger? Not subjugate it, not sublimate it, not suppress it, which are all idiotic and immature; but how to be really free from it? And to be really free from it, we have to discover whether the word is more important than the feeling. The word 'anger' has more significance than the feeling itself. And, to find that out, there must be a gap between the feeling and the naming. That is one part.

Then, if I do not name a feeling, that is, if thought is not functioning merely because of words, or if I do not think in terms of words, images, or symbols, which most of us do—then what happens? Surely, the mind, then, is not merely the observer. That is, when the mind is not thinking in terms of words, symbols, images, there is no thinker separate from the thought, which is the word. Then the mind is quiet, is it not?—not made quiet, it is quiet. And, when the mind is really quiet, then the feelings that arise can be dealt with immediately. It is only when we give names to feelings and thereby strengthen them that the feelings have continuity; they are stored up in the center, from which we give further labels, either to strengthen or to communicate them.

So, when the mind is no longer the center as the thinker made up of words, of past experiences—which are all memories, labels, stored and put in categories, in pigeonholes—, when it is not doing any of those things, then, obviously the mind is quiet. It is no longer bound, it has no longer a center as the me—my house, my achievement, my work—which are still words, giving impetus to feeling, and thereby strengthening memory. When none of those things are happening, the mind is very quiet. That state is not negation. On the contrary, to come to that point, you have to go through all this, which is an enormous undertaking; it is not merely learning a few sets of words and repeating them like a school boy—not to name, not to name. To follow through all its implications, to experience it, to see how the mind works and thereby come to that point when you are no longer naming, which means that there is no longer a center apart from the thought—surely, this whole process is real meditation. And when the mind is really tranquil, then it is possible for that which is immeasurable to come into being. Any other process, any other search for reality, is

self-projected, home-made, and therefore unreal. But this process is arduous, and it means that the mind has to be constantly aware of everything that is inwardly happening to it. To come to this point, there can be no judgment or justification from the beginning to the end—not that this is an end. There is no end, because there is something extraordinary still going on. There is no promise. It is for you to experiment, to go into yourself deeper and deeper and deeper, so that all the many layers of the center are dissolved; and you can do it rapidly, or lazily. But it is extraordinarily interesting to watch the process of the mind, how it depends on words, how the words stimulate memory, resuscitate the dead experience and give life to it. And, in that process the mind is living, either in the future or in the past. Therefore, words have an enormous significance, neurologically as well as psychologically. And please, don't learn all this from me, or from a book. You cannot learn it from another, or find it in a book. What you learn, or find in a book, won't be the real. But you can experience it, you can watch yourself in action, watch yourself thinking, see how you think, how rapidly you are naming the feeling as it arises—and watching this whole process, frees the mind from its center. Then the mind, being quiet, can receive that which is eternal.

Question : What is the right relationship, if any, between the individual and the collective, the mass ?

KRISHNAMURTI : 'Do you think there is any relationship between the individual and the mass? Between you and the collective? The State, the government, would like us to be merely the citizen, the collective. But we are man first, and afterwards the citizen—not the citizen first, and man afterwards. The State would like us not to be the man, the in-

dividual, but the mass. Because, the more we are the citizen, the greater our capacity, the greater our efficiency—we become the tool which the bureaucrats, the authoritarian states, the governments, want us to be.

So, we must distinguish between the private individual and the citizen, the man and the mass. The individual, the man, has his private feelings, hopes, failures, disappointments, longings, sensations, pleasures. And there is the point of view which wants to reduce all that to the collective; for it is very simple to deal with the collective. Pass an edict, and it is done. Give a sanction, and it is followed. So, the more organizations there are, and the more efficiently they are organized, the more the individual is denied, whether by the church or by the State—we are then all Christians, all Hindus, not individuals. And with that mentality, in that state, which most of us want, has the individual reality any place? We recognize there must be collective action. But does collective action come into being with the denial of the individual? Is the individual in opposition to the collective? Is the collective not fictitious, the mass not unreal? Seeing the difficulty of dealing with the individual, we create the opposite, the mass, and then try to establish a relationship between the individual and the collective. If the individual is intelligent, he will co-operate. Surely, that is our problem, isn't it? We first create the mass, and then try to find the relationship of the individual with the mass. But let us find out if the mass is real. The group of us here can be made into the collective by hypnotism, by propaganda; through various means we can be aroused to act collectively for an ideology, for a State, for a church, for an idea, and so on, and so on. That is, collective action can be externally imposed, directed, compelled, through fear, reward, and all the rest of it. Having produced that condition, we try to establish the relation-

ship of the individual, which is the actual, with that which is produced. Whereas, is it not possible for the individual to lose his sense of separateness through definite understanding of all the implications of separateness, and therefore act cooperatively? But, as that is so difficult, States, governments, churches, organized religions, force or entice the individual to become the corporate. What place has the individual in history? What does it matter what you and I do? There is the historical movement going on. What place has reality with this movement? Probably none at all. You and I don't count at all. This movement is gigantic, it is going on; it has the momentum of centuries, and it will go on. What is your relationship, as an individual, to this movement? Whatever you do, will it affect it? Can you stop a war because you are a pacifist? You are a pacifist, not because there is a war, not because you have found a relationship with it, but because in itself war is wrong and you feel you cannot kill, and there the matter ends. But to try to find a relationship between your understanding, your intelligence, and this monstrous, logical movement of war, seems to me utterly futile. I can be an individual and yet see what creates anti-social feelings in me, and so be free of separative action. I may have a little property; surely, that doesn't make me a separative entity. But it is the whole psychological state to be separate, to be isolated, to be something—it is that which is calamitous, which is so destructive. And, in order to overcome that, we have all the external sanctions and impositions and edicts.

Question : What is the significance of pain and suffering?

KRISHNAMURTI : When you suffer, when you have pain, what is the significance of it? Physical pain has one significance, but probably we

mean psychological pain and suffering, which has quite a different significance at different levels. What is the significance of suffering? Why do you want to find the significance of suffering? Not that it has no significance—we are going to find out. But why do you want to find it? Why do you want to find out why you suffer? When you put that question to yourself, 'Why do I suffer?', and are looking for the cause of suffering, are you not escaping from suffering? When I seek the significance of suffering, am I not avoiding, evading it, running away from it? The fact is, I am suffering; but the moment I bring the mind to operate upon it and say, 'Now, why?', I have already diluted the intensity of suffering. In other words, we want suffering to be diluted, alleviated, put away, explained away. Surely, that doesn't give an understanding of suffering. So, if I am free from that desire to run away from it, then I begin to understand what is the content of suffering.

Now, what is suffering? A disturbance, isn't it?, at different levels—at the physical, and at the different levels of the subconscious. It is an acute form of disturbance, which I don't like. My son is dead. I have built around him all my hopes—or around my daughter, my husband, what you will. I have enshrined him, with all the things I wanted him to be. And I have kept him as my companion—you know, all that; and suddenly he is gone. So, there is a disturbance, isn't there? That disturbance I call suffering. Please, I am not being harsh, we are examining, trying to understand it. If I don't like that suffering, then I say, 'Why am I suffering?' 'I loved him so much', 'He was this'. 'I had that'. And I try to escape in words in labels, in beliefs, as most of us do. They act as a narcotic. But, if I do not do that, what happens? I am simply aware of suffering. I condemn it, I don't justify suffering. Then I can .

movement, can't I? Then I can follow the whole content of what it means—'I follow' in the sense of trying to understand something.

So, what does it mean? What is it that is suffering? Not why there is suffering, not what is the cause of suffering, but what is actually happening? I do not know if you see the difference. Then I am simply aware of suffering, not as apart from me, not as an observer watching suffering—it is part of me, that is, the whole of me is suffering. Then I am able to follow its movement, see where it leads. Surely, if I do that, then it opens up, does it not? Then I see that I have laid emphasis on the me—not on the person whom I love. He only acted to cover me from my misery, from my loneliness, from my misfortune. As I am not something, I hoped he would be that. So, that has gone; I am left, I am lost, I am lonely. Without him, I am nothing. So I cry. It is not that he is gone, but that I am left. I am alone. To come to that point is very difficult, isn't it? It is difficult to really recognize it, and not merely say, 'I am alone, and how am I to get rid of that loneliness?', which is another form of escape; but to be conscious of it, to remain with it, to see its movement. I am only taking this as an example. So, gradually, if I allow it to unfold, to open up, I see that I am suffering because I am lost; I am being called to give my attention to something which I am not willing to look at; something is being forced upon me which I am reluctant to see and to understand. And there are innumerable people to help me to escape—thousands of so-called religious people, with their beliefs and dogmas, hopes and fantasies—'it is karma, it is God's will', you know, all giving me a way out. But if I can stay with it and not put it away from me, not try to circumscribe or deny it, then what happens? What is the state of my mind when it is thus following the movement of suffering? Now, please follow this,

continuing what we discussed previously.

Is suffering merely a word, or an actuality? If it is an actuality, and not just a word, then the word has no meaning now. So, there is merely the feeling of intense pain. With regard to what? With regard to an image, to an experience, to something which you have, or have not. If you have it, you call it pleasure: if you haven't, it is pain. So, pain, sorrow, is in relationship to something. Is that something merely a verbalization, or an actuality? I don't know if you are following all this. That is, when sorrow exists, it exists only in relationship to something. It cannot exist by itself—as fear cannot exist by itself, but in relationship to something: to an individual, to an incident, to a feeling. Now, you are fully aware of the suffering. Is that suffering apart from you, and therefore you are merely the observer who perceives the suffering; or, is that suffering part of you? Surely, we are trying to understand what suffering, pain, is; we are trying to go into it fully, not just superficially.

Now, when there is no observer who is suffering, is the suffering different from you? You are the suffering, are you not? You are not apart from the pain—you are the pain. Now, what happens? Please, follow it up. There is no labelling, there is no giving it a name and thereby brushing it aside—you are merely that pain, that feeling, that sense of agony. Then, when you are that, what happens? When you do not name it, when there is no fear with regard to it, is the center related to it? If the center is related to it, then it is afraid of it. Then it must act and do something about it. But if the center is that, then what do you do? There is nothing to be done, is there? Please, it is not mere acceptance. Follow it, and you will see. If you are that, and you are not accepting it, not labelling it, not pushing it aside—if you are that thing, what happens? Do you say

you suffer then? Surely, a fundamental transformation has taken place. Then there is no longer 'I suffer', because there is no center to suffer; and the center suffers, because we have never examined what the center is. We just live from word to word, from reaction to reaction. We never say, 'Let me see what that thing is that suffers'. And you cannot see by enforcement, by discipline. You must look with interest, with spontaneous comprehension. Then you will see that the thing we call suffering, pain, the thing that we avoid, and the discipline, all have gone. As long as I have no relationship to the thing as outside of me, the problem is not; but the moment I establish a relationship with it outside me, the problem is. As long as I treat suffering as something outside—I suffer because I lost my brother, because I have no money, because of this or that—I establish a relationship to it, and that relationship is fictitious. But if I am that thing, if I see the fact, then the whole thing is transformed, it all has a different meaning. Then there is full attention, integrated attention; and that which is completely regarded, is understood and dissolved, and so there is no fear; and therefore the word 'sorrow' is non-existent.

August 21, 1949

XIII

For the past few weeks we have been discussing the importance of self-knowledge, and how it is essential, before there can be any action, before there can be right thinking, that one should know oneself; not only the superficial, conscious mind, but also the hidden, the unconscious. And those of you who have tried and experimented with what we have been discussing, must have come upon a very curious thing in experimenting: that through self-know-

ledge one accentuates self-consciousness. That is, one becomes more concerned about oneself. Most of us are caught in that, and one doesn't seem able to go beyond. And I would like to discuss this evening why it is that most of us contain ourselves, limit ourselves in self-consciousness, and are not capable of going beyond. Because, there is a great deal in it which needs further explanation and discussion; but, before I go into that, I would like to point out one or two things.

First of all, please don't bother to take photographs. You know, all this, what one is talking about, is very serious, at least for me. This is not meant for autograph-hunters. You wouldn't be thinking of taking pictures and asking for autographs if you were really very, very serious. Also, if I may say so, it is so infantile, immature. And the other thing I would like to point out is that, as I have already said before, you and I are trying to experiment together here, to feel our way into the problems that confront us. And that is impossible if you are anxiously interested in taking notes of what I am saying. You should be able to deal directly with the problem, not think it over afterwards; because, when you are really experiencing something, you don't take notes. You take notes when you are not experiencing, when you are not really thinking, feeling, experimenting. But if you are really experiencing, going along with what is being said, then there is no time or occasion to take notes. Surely, experiencing does not come through words. That is only furthering sensation; but there is an experiencing, if we can go more and more deeply and immediately into what is being said. So; it would be good, if each one of us were serious enough to experiment with what is being said, and not merely postpone or be distracted from the central issue.

As I was saying, in the search of self-knowledge, in the exploration of

it, one gets caught in self-consciousness, one accentuates, emphasizes the me more and more; and how is it that that happens? As we have said during all these talks, what is important is the freedom from the me, the mine, the self; because, obviously, a man who does not know the whole process and content of the self, is incapable of right thinking—which is axiomatic. But yet we shun, we avoid the understanding of the self; and we think that by avoiding it, we shall be able to deal with the self or forget it more easily. Whereas, if we are capable of looking at it more intensely, more attentively, there is the danger of becoming more and more self-conscious. And is it possible to go beyond?

Now, to understand that, we have to go into the problem of sincerity. Simplicity is not sincerity. One who is sincere can never be simple; because the one who is trying to be sincere, has always the desire to fashion or to approximate himself to an idea. And one needs extraordinary simplicity to understand oneself, the simplicity which comes when there is no desire to attain, to achieve, to gain something; and the moment we desire to gain something through self-knowledge, there is self-consciousness in which we get caught—which is a fact. If you do not merely examine what the various psychologists and saints have said, but experiment with yourself, you will come to a point when you will see that unless there is, not sincerity, but complete simplicity, you cannot proceed. Self-consciousness arises only when there is a desire to achieve something—happiness, reality, or even understanding—through self-knowledge. That is, when there is a desire for achievement through self-knowledge, there is self-consciousness, which prevents going further into the problem. And as most of us, especially so-called religious people, try to be sincere, we have to understand this question, this word 'sincerity'. Because sincerity deve-

lops will, and will is essentially desire. You have to be sincere in order to approximate yourself to an idea; and hence the pattern and the carrying out of that pattern become most important. To carry out a pattern, you must have will, which denies simplicity. Simplicity comes into being only when there is freedom from the desire to achieve, and when you are willing to go into self-knowledge without any end in view. And I think that that is really important to think over. What is required is not sincerity, not the exertion of will to be or not to be something, but to understand oneself from moment to moment, spontaneously, as things arise. How can you be spontaneous when you are approximating yourself to something?

When do you discover anything in yourself? Only at unexpected moments, when you are not consciously, deliberately, shaping your mind, your thoughts and feelings; only when there is a spontaneous response to the incidents of life. Then, according to those responses, you find out. But a man who is trying to be sincere to an idea can never be simple; and therefore, there can never be full, complete self-knowledge. And self-knowledge can be discovered more fully, more deeply and widely, only when there is passive awareness, which is not an exertion of will. Will and sincerity go together; simplicity and passive awareness are companions. Because, when one is passively aware, deeply, then there is a possibility of immediate understanding. As we discussed, when you want to understand something, if you are all the time consumed with the desire to understand it, making an effort to understand it, naturally there is no understanding. But if there is a passive, alert awareness, then there is a possibility of understanding. Similarly, to understand oneself ever more deeply and widely, there must be passive awareness, which is extremely difficult; for, most of us either condemn or justify. We never

look at anything passively. We project ourselves upon the subject—a painting, a poem, or anything else—especially where we are concerned. We are incapable of looking at ourselves without any condemnation or justification; and that is essential, surely, if we are to understand more and more widely and deeply. As most of us, in the search of self-knowledge, get caught in self-consciousness, the danger is, that being caught, we make that in which we are caught the most important thing. To go beyond self-consciousness, there must be freedom from the desire to achieve a result. Because, after all, the attainment of a result is what the mind wants : it wants to be secure, to be safe, and therefore projects, out of its own momentum, an image; an idea, in which it takes shelter. And to avoid all the illusions that the mind creates, to avoid being caught in them, is possible only when there is no desire for a result; only when one is living from moment to moment.

Question : Would you please explain what you mean by dying daily?

KRISHNAMURTI: Why is it that we are so frightened of death? Because death is the unknown. We don't know what is going to happen tomorrow; actually, we don't know what is going to happen. Though we build for tomorrow, actually, realistically, we don't know; and so there is always the fear of tomorrow. So, fear is the guiding factor, which is the incapacity to meet the unknown, and therefore we continue taking today over into tomorrow. That is what we are doing, is it not? We give continuity to our idiosyncrasies, to our jealousies, to our stupidities, to our memories; wherever we are, we carry them over from day to day. Don't we do that? And so there is no dying, there is only an assurance of continuity. That is a fact. Our names, our actions, the things that

we do, our property, the desire to be—all these give a continuity. Now, that which continues obviously cannot renew. There can be renewal only when there is an ending. If you are the same tomorrow as you are today, how can there be renewal? That is, if you are attached to an idea, to an experience, which you have had yesterday and which you desire to continue tomorrow, there is no renewal; there is a continuity of the memory of the sensation of that experience, but the experience itself is dead. There is only the memory of the sensation of that experience: and it is that sensation you want to continue. And where there is continuity, obviously there is no renewal. And yet it is what most of us want: we want to continue. We want to continue with our worries, with our pleasures, with our memories; and so most of us are actually uncreative. There is no possibility of a rebirth, a renewal. Whereas, if each day we died, finished at the end of the day all our worries, all our jealousies, all our idiocies and vanities, our cruel gossip—you know, the whole business; if each day we came to an end and did not carry all that over into tomorrow, then there would be a possibility of renewal, would there not?

So, why do we accumulate? And what is it that we accumulate, apart from furniture and a few other things? What is it that we accumulate? Ideas, words, and memories, do we not? And with these we live—we are those things. With those things we want to live, we want to continue. But if we did not continue, there would be a possibility of a new understanding, a new opening. This is not metaphysical, this is not something fantastic. Experiment with it yourself and you will see that an extraordinary thing takes place. How the mind worries over a problem, over and over and over again, day after day! Such a mind is incapable, obviously, of seeing something new, is it not? We are caught in our

beliefs—religious, sociological, or any other form of belief ; and those beliefs are oneself. Beliefs are words, and the word becomes important ; and so we live in a sensation which we want to continue, and therefore there is no renewal. But if one does not continue, if one does not give continuity to a worry, but thinks it out, goes into it fully, and dissolves it, then one's mind is fresh to meet something else anew. But the difficulty is that most of us want to live in the past, in past memories, or in the future, future hopes, future longings ; which indicates that the present is not significant, and therefore we live yesterday and tomorrow, and give continuity to both. If one actually experiments with this thing, really dying each day, each minute, to everything that one has accumulated, then there is a possibility of immortality. Immortality is not continuity, which is merely time ; there is continuity only to memory, to ideas, to words. But, when there is freedom from continuity, then there is a state of timelessness, which cannot be understood if you are merely the result of continuity. Therefore, it is important to die every minute and to be reborn again—not as you were yesterday. This is really very important, if you would go into it seriously. Because, in this there is a possibility of creation, of transformation. And most of our lives are so unhappy, because we don't know how to renew ; we are worn out, we are destroyed by yesterday, by yesterday's memories, misfortunes, unhappiness, incidents, failures. Yesterday burdens our minds and hearts ; and with that burden we want to understand something which cannot be understood within the limits of time. And that is why it is essential, if one would be creative, in the deep sense of that word, that there be death to all the accumulations of every minute. This is not fantastic, this is not some mystical experience. One can experience this directly, simply, one understands the whole

significance of how time as continuity prevents creativeness.

Question : How does a truth, as you have said, when repeated, become a lie ? What really is a lie ? Why is it wrong to lie ? Is this not a profound and subtle problem on all the levels of our existence ?

KRISHNAMURTI : There are two questions in this, so let us examine the first which is : When a truth is repeated, how does it become a lie ? What is it that we repeat ? Can you repeat an understanding ? I understand something. Can I repeat that ? I can verbalize it, I can communicate it ; but the experience is not what is repeated, surely. But we get caught in the word, and miss the significance of the experience. If you had an experience, can you repeat it ? You may want to repeat it, you may have the desire for its repetition, for its sensation ; but once you have an experience, it is over, it cannot be repeated. What can be repeated is the sensation, and the corresponding word that gives life to that sensation. And as, unfortunately, most of us are propagandists, we are caught in the repetition of the word. So, we live on words, and the truth is denied.

Take, for example, the feeling of love. Can you repeat it ? When you bear, 'Love your neighbor', is that a truth to you ? It is truth, only when you love your neighbor ; and that love cannot be repeated, but only the word. Yet most of us are happy, content, with the repetition, 'Love your neighbor', or, 'Don't be greedy'. So, the truth of another, or an actual experience which you have had, merely through repetition does not become a reality. On the contrary, repetition prevents reality. Merely repeating certain ideas is not reality.

Now, the difficulty in this is to understand the question without thinking in terms of the opposite. A lie is not something opposed to truth.

One can see the truth of what is being said, not in opposition, or in contrast, as a lie or a truth ; but just see that most of us repeat without understanding. For instance, we have been discussing 'not naming'. Many of you will repeat it, I am sure of it, thinking that it is the 'truth'. You will never repeat an experience if it is a direct experience. You may communicate it ; but when it is a real experience, the sensations behind it are gone, the emotional content behind the words is entirely dissipated.

Take, for example, the question, which we discussed a few weeks ago, that the thinker and the thought are one. It may be a truth to you, because you have directly experienced it. But if I repeated it, it would not be true, would it ?—true, not as opposed to the false, please. It wouldn't be actual, it would be merely repetitive, and therefore would have no significance. But you see, by repetition, we create a dogma, we build a church, and in that we take refuge. The word, and not truth, becomes the 'truth'. The word is not the thing. But to us, the thing is the word ; and that is why one has to be so extremely careful not to repeat something which one does not really understand. If you understand something, you can communicate it ; but the words and the memory have lost their emotional significance. Thereby, in ordinary conversation, one's outlook, one's vocabulary, changes.

So, as we are seeking truth through self-knowledge, and are not mere propagandists, it is important to understand this. Because, through repetition one mesmerizes oneself by words, or by sensations. One gets caught in illusions. And, to be free of that, it is imperative to experience directly ; and to experience directly, one must be aware of oneself in the process of repetition, of habits, of words, of sensations. That awareness gives one an extraordinary freedom, so that there can be a renewal, a constant experiencing, a newness.

The other question is : "What really is a lie ? Why is it wrong to lie ? Is this not a profound and subtle problem on all the levels of our existence ?" What is a lie ? A contradiction, isn't it ?, a self-contradiction. One can consciously contradict, or unconsciously ; it can either be deliberate, or unconscious ; the contradiction can be either very, very subtle, or obvious. And when the cleavage in contradiction is very great, then either one becomes unbalanced, or one realizes the cleavage, and sets about to mend it. Now, to understand this problem, what is a lie and why we lie, one has to go into it without thinking in terms of an opposite. Can we look at this problem of contradiction in ourselves without trying not to be contradictory ? I don't know if I am making myself clear. Our difficulty in examining this question is, isn't it ?, that we so readily condemn a lie : but, to understand it, can we think of it, not in terms of truth and falsehood, but of what is contradiction ? Why do we contradict ? Why is there contradiction in ourselves ? Is there not an attempt to live up to a standard, up to a pattern—a constant approximation of ourselves to a pattern, a constant effort to be something, either in the eyes of another, or in our own eyes ? There is a desire, is there not ?, to conform to a pattern ; and when one is not living up to that pattern, there is a contradiction.

Now, why do we have a pattern, a standard, an approximation, an idea which we are trying to live up to ? Why ? Obviously, to be secure, to be safe, to be popular, to have a good opinion of ourselves, and so on, and so on. There is the seed of contradiction. As long as we are approximating ourselves to something, trying to be something, there must be contradiction ; therefore, there must be this cleavage between the false and the true. I think this is important, if you will quietly go into it. Not that there is not the false and the true ;

but why the contradiction in ourselves? Is it not because we are attempting to be something—to be noble, to be good, to be virtuous, to be creative, to be happy, and so on, and so on? And, in the very desire to be something, there is a contradiction, not to be something else. And it is this contradiction that is so destructive. If one is capable of complete identification with something, with this or with that, then contradiction ceases; but when we do identify ourselves completely with something, there is self-enclosure, there is a resistance, which brings about unbalance—which is an obvious thing.

So, why is there contradiction in ourselves? I have done something, and I don't want it to be discovered; I have thought something which doesn't come up to the mark, which puts me in a state of contradiction, and I don't like it. So, where there is an approximation, there must be fear; and it is this fear that contradicts. Whereas, if there is no becoming, no attempting to be something, then there is no sense of fear; then there is no contradiction; then there is no lie in us at any level, consciously or unconsciously—something to be suppressed, something to be shown. And as most of our lives are a matter of moods and poses, depending on our moods, we pose—which is a contradiction. When the mood disappears, we are what we are. It is this contradiction that is really important, not whether you tell a polite white lie or not. As long as this contradiction exists, there must be a superficial existence and therefore superficial fears which have to be guarded—and then white lies, you know, all the rest of it follows. We can look at this question, not asking what is a lie and what is truth, but without taking the opposites, go into the problem of contradiction in ourselves—which is extremely difficult. Because, as we depend so much on our sensations, most of our lives are contradictory. We depend on memories, on opinions, on beliefs so many

fears which we want to cover up—all these create contradiction in ourselves; and when that contradiction becomes unbearable, one goes off one's head. One wants peace, and everything that one does, creates war, not only in the family, but outside. And, instead of understanding what creates conflict, we only try to become more and more one thing or the other, the opposite, thereby creating greater cleavage.

So, is it possible to understand why there is contradiction in ourselves—not only superficially, but much more deeply, psychologically? First of all, is one aware that one lives a contradictory life? We want peace, and we are nationalists; we want to avoid social misery, and yet each one of us is so individualistic, limited, self-enclosed. So we are constantly living in contradiction. Why? Is it not because we are slaves to sensation? This is neither to be denied nor accepted. It requires a great deal of understanding of the implications of sensation, which are desires. We want so many things, all in contradiction with one another. We are so many conflicting masks; we take on a mask when it suits us, and deny it when something else is more profitable, more pleasurable. It is this state of contradiction that creates the lie. And, in opposition to that we create 'truth'. But, surely, truth is not the opposite of lie. That which has an opposite, is not truth. The opposite contains its own opposite, therefore it is not truth; and to understand this problem very profoundly, one must be aware of all the contradictions in which we live. When I say, 'I love you', with it goes jealousy, envy, anxiety, fear—which is a contradiction. And it is this contradiction that must be understood; and one can understand it only when one is aware of it, aware without any condemnation or justification—merely looking at it. And to look at it passively, one has to understand all the processes of justification and condemnation. So, it is not an easy

problem to look passively at something; but in understanding that, one begins to understand the whole process of the ways of one's feeling and thinking. And, when one is aware of the full significance of contradiction in oneself, it does bring an extraordinary change: you are yourself then, not something which you are trying to be. You are no longer following an ideal, seeking happiness. You are what you are, and from there you can proceed. Then there is no possibility of contradiction.

Question: I feel sincerely that I desire to help people, and I think I can help; but whatever I say or do to another is interpreted as interference, and as the desire to domineer. So I am thwarted by others and feel myself frustrated. Why does this happen to me?

KRISHNAMURTI: When we say we want to help another, what do we mean by that word? Like the word 'service'; what does it mean? You go to the gas station, the attendant serves you, and you pay him; but he uses the word 'serve', like all the business people. All the commercial people use that word. Now those who wish to serve, have they not also the same spirit? They want to help if you also give them something; that is, they want to help you in order to fulfill themselves. And when you resist, you begin to criticize, they feel frustrated. In other words, they are not really helping you. Through help, through service, they are fulfilling themselves. In other words, they are seeking self-fulfillment under the guise of help and service—which, when thwarted, gets angry, begins to gossip, begins to tear you to pieces. This is an obvious fact, is it not? And can you not help and serve another without asking anything?—which is most difficult, which is not easy, you cannot just say, 'It can be done'. When you give something to somebody, 'a few

hundred dollars, haven't you something with which you are tied, don't you tie yourself with that hundred dollars, hasn't it a tail? Can you give, and forget? This giving from the heart is real generosity. But the generosity of the hand has always something to be held; and it holds. Similarly, those who want to help, when they are prevented for various reasons, feel frustrated, feel lost; they won't stand criticism; it is misrepresented, mistranslated, misinterpreted; because through their anxiety to help you, they are fulfilling themselves.

So, the problem is, is it not?, is there self-fulfillment? That is the next question. Is there self-fulfillment? Is not that word 'self-fulfillment' a contradiction? When you want to fulfill yourself in something, what is that something in which you are fulfilling? Is it not self-projection? Say, I want to help you. I use the word 'help', which covers my desire for self-fulfillment. What happens when I have such a desire? I neither help you, nor fulfill. Because, to fulfill means, for most of us, to have pleasure in doing something which gives us gratification. In other words, self-fulfillment is gratification, is it not? I am seeking gratification, superficial or permanent, which I call self-fulfillment. But can gratification be permanent? Obviously not. Surely, when we talk about self-fulfillment we mean a gratification that is deeper, more profound, than the superficial; but can gratification ever be permanent? As it can never be permanent, we change our self-fulfillment—at one period it is this, and later it is that; and ultimately we say, 'My fulfillment must be in God, in reality'. Which means, we make of reality a permanent gratification. So, in other words, we are seeking gratification when we talk of self-fulfillment. And, instead of saying, 'I want to help you in order to gratify myself', which would be too crude and we are too subtle for that, we say, 'I want to serve you, I want

to help you'. And when we are prevented, we feel lost, we feel frustrated, angry, irritated. Under the guise of help and service we do a lot of monstrous things—deceptions, illusions. Therefore, words like 'self-fulfillment', like 'help', like 'service', need examination. And when we really understand them, not just verbally, but deeply, profoundly, then we will help without asking anything in return. Such help will never be misrepresented—and even if it is, it doesn't matter. Then there is no sense of frustration, no sense of anger, criticism, gossip.

Question : What is aloneness? Is it a mystical state? Does it imply freeing oneself from relationship? Is aloneness a way to understanding, or is it an escape from outward conflicts and inward pressures?

KRISHNAMURTI: Are not most of us trying to isolate ourselves in relationship? We try to possess people, we try to dominate people—which is a form of isolation, is it not? Our beliefs, our ideas, are a form of isolation. When we withdraw, when we renounce, it is a form of isolation, is it not? The inward pressures and outward conflicts force us to protect ourselves, to enclose ourselves. That is a form of isolation, is it not? And through isolation, can there be any understanding? Do I understand you if I resist you, if I enclose myself within my ideas, my prejudices, my criticism of you, and so on, and so on? I can understand you only when I am not isolated, when there is no barrier between us, neither a verbal barrier, nor the barrier of psychological states, of moods and idiosyncrasies. But to understand, I must be alone, must I not? Alone in the sense of unenclosed, uninfluenced. Most of us are put together; we are made up of memories, of idiosyncrasies, of prejudices, of innumerable influences. And through all that we try to understand something. How

can there be understanding when we are produced, brought together, made up? And when there is a freedom from that, there is an aloneness which is not an escape. On the contrary, it is the understanding of all these things that brings about an aloneness, with which you meet life directly. If we are a mass of opinions, beliefs, if we are merely put together, we think that we are an integrated being, or we try to seek integration with all these burdens. Surely, there can be integration, not merely at the superficial level, but completely, right through, only when there is a freedom, through understanding, from all the influences that are constantly impinging upon one—beliefs, memories, idiosyncrasies, and so on; one cannot merely throw them aside. Then, as one begins to understand these, there is an aloneness which is not contradiction, which is not an opposite of the collective or the individual. When you would understand something, aren't you alone? Aren't you completely integrated at that moment? Is not your attention completely given? And through withdrawal, can there be any understanding? Through resistance, can there be any understanding? When you renounce something, does that bring understanding? Surely, understanding comes, not through resistance, not through withdrawal, not through renunciation. Only when you understand the full significance of a problem, then the problem disappears. You don't have to renounce it. You don't have to renounce wealth, certain obvious greeds. But when you are capable of looking at them directly, without any criticism, being passively aware of them, they drop away from you. And in that state of passive awareness, is there not complete attention?—not as an opposite, or exclusive concentration. It is an awareness in which there is no contradiction; and therefore loneliness disappears. Most of us are lonely, most of us are solitary—there is no depth, we come to an end

XIV

very quickly. And it is this loneliness that creates the withdrawals, the escapes, the covering up; and if we would understand that loneliness, we must discard all these coverings, and be with it. It is that being that is alone. Then you are uninfluenced, then you are not caught in moods; and it is essential to be alone—which most of us dread. We hardly ever go out by ourselves; we always have the radio, magazines, newspapers, books; or, if we haven't those, we are occupied with our own thoughts. The mind is never quiet. It is this quietness that is alone. That aloneness is not induced, is not made up. When there is a lot of noise and you are silent, you are alone, are you not? You must be alone. If you are a success, then there is something obviously wrong. Most of us seek success, and that is why we are never alone; we are lonely, but we are never alone.

Only when there is aloneness, then you can meet that which is true, which has no comparison. And, as most of us are afraid to be alone, we build various refuges, various safeties, and give them big-sounding names; and they offer marvellous escapes. But they are all illusions, they have no significance. It is only when we see that they have no significance—actually, not verbally—only then are we alone. Then alone can we really understand; which means that we have to strip ourselves of all past experiences, of memories, of sensations, which we have built so sedulously and guard so carefully. Surely, only an unconditioned mind can understand that which is unconditioned, reality; and to uncondition the mind, one must not only face loneliness, but go beyond; one must not hold on to memories that are crowding in. For memories are mere words, words that have sensations. It is only when the mind is utterly quiet, uninfluenced, that it can realize that which is.

August 27, 1949

This morning I shall answer some of the questions first, and then wind up with a talk. Many questions have been sent in, and, unfortunately, it has not been possible to answer all of them. So, I have chosen those which are representative and have tried to answer as many of them as possible. And also, in answering questions, naturally one cannot go into full details, because that would take too long; and so one can only deal with the fundamentals: the details will have to be filled in by yourself. Those of you who have been coming here regularly will find that, if you carry away not merely a memory of the words and the pleasant sensations of listening under trees, of being distracted by birds, cameras, notes, and the various things that divert the mind—if you live not merely in words, but are really living, actually experiencing those things that we have discussed, then you will find that, having understood the outline from the answers which have been somewhat brief and succinct, you can fill in the details.

Question : Ideas do separate, but ideas also bring people together. Is this not the expression of love which makes communal life possible ?

KRISHNAMURTI : I wonder, when you ask such a question, whether you do realize that ideas, beliefs, opinions, separate people; that ideologies break up, that ideas inevitably disrupt? Ideas do not hold people together—though you may try to bring together people belonging to differing and opposed ideologies. Ideas can never bring people together, which is obvious. Because, ideas can always be opposed and destroyed through conflict. After all, ideas are images, sensations, words. Can words, sensations, thoughts, bring people together? Or does one require quite a different thing to bring

people together? One sees that hate, fear, and nationalism, bring people together. Fear brings people together. A common hatred sometimes brings together people opposed to one another, as nationalism brings together people of opposing groups. Surely, these are ideas. And is love an idea? Can you think about love? You are able to think about the person whom you love, or the group of people whom you love. But is that love? When there is thought about love, is that love? Is thought love? And, surely, only love can bring people together, not thought—not one group in opposition to another group. Where love is, there is no group, no class, no nationality. So, one has to find out what we mean by love.

We know what we mean by ideas, opinions, beliefs, which we have sufficiently discussed during the past several weeks. So, what do we mean by love? Is it a thing of the mind? It is a thing of the mind, when the things of the mind fill the heart. And with most of us, it is so. We have filled our heart with the things of the mind, which are opinions, ideas, sensations, beliefs; and around that and in that we live and love. But is that love? Can we think about love? When you love, is thought functioning? Love and thought are not in opposition, do not let us divide them as opposites. When one loves, is there a sense of separateness, of bringing people together, or disbanding them, pushing them away? Surely, that state of love can be experienced only when the process of thought is not functioning—which does not mean that one must become crazy, unbalanced. On the contrary. It requires the highest form of thought to go beyond.

So, love is not a thing of the mind. It is only when the mind is really quiet, when it is no longer expecting, asking, demanding, seeking, possessing, being jealous, fearful, anxious—when the mind is really silent, only then is there is possibility of love. When the mind is no longer project-

ing itself, pursuing its particular sensations, demands, urges, hidden fears, seeking self-fulfillment, held in bondage to belief—only then is there a possibility of love. But most of us think love can go with jealousy, with ambition, with the pursuit of personal desires and ambitions. Surely, when these things exist, love is not. So, we must be concerned, not with love, which comes into being spontaneously, without our particularly seeking it, but we must be concerned with the things that are hindering love, with the things of the mind which project themselves and create a barrier. And that is why it is important, before we can know what love is, to know what is the process of the mind, which is the seat of the self. And that is why it is important to go ever more deeply into the question of self-knowledge—not merely say, 'I must love', or, 'Love brings people together', or, 'Ideas disrupt', which would be a mere repetition of what you have heard, therefore, utterly useless. Words entangle. But, if one can understand the whole significance of the ways of one's thought, the ways of one's desires and their pursuits and ambitions, then there is a possibility of having or understanding that which is love. But that requires an extraordinary understanding of oneself. When there is self-abnegation, when there is self-forgetfulness—not intentionally, but spontaneously; that self-forgetfulness, self-denial, which is not the outcome of a series of practices, disciplines, which only limit—then there is a possibility of love. That self-denial comes into being when the whole process of the self is understood, consciously as well as unconsciously, in the waking hours as well as in dreaming. Then, the total process of the mind is understood as it is actually taking place in relationship, in every incident, in every response to every challenge that one has. In understanding that, and therefore freeing the mind from its own self-erecting, self-limiting pro-

cess, there is a possibility of love. Love is not sentiment, not romanticism, not dependent on something; and that state is extremely arduous and difficult to understand, or to be in. Because our minds are always interfering, limiting, encroaching upon its functioning; and therefore it is important to understand first the mind and its ways; otherwise we shall be caught in illusions, caught in words and sensations that have very little significance. And as, for most people, ideas merely act as refuge, as an escape, ideas which have become beliefs, naturally they prevent complete living, complete action, right thinking. It is possible to think rightly, to live freely and intelligently, only when there is ever deeper and wider self-knowledge.

Question: Would you kindly explain the distinction you make between factual and psychological memory?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do not let us bother for the moment with the distinction between factual and psychological memory. Let us consider memory. Why do we live in memories? Are memories separate from us? Are you different from memory? What do we mean by memory? It is the residue of certain incidents, experiences, sensations, is it not? You have had an experience yesterday; it has left a certain mark, a certain sensation. That sensation we call memory, verbalized or not; and we are the sum total of all these memories, all these residues. Surely, you are not different from your memory. There are conscious memories, as there are the unconscious. The conscious memories respond easily, spontaneously; and the unconscious memories are very deep, hidden, quiet, waiting, watchful. All of that, surely, is you and me: the racial, the group, the particular—all that, all those memories, are you and me. You are not different from your

memories. Remove your memories, where are you? If you remove them, you will end up in an asylum. But, why does the mind—which is the result of memories, of the past—, why does the mind cling to the past? That is the question, is it not? Why does the mind—which is the result of the past, which is the outcome of yesterday, of many yesterdays—, why does the thinker cling to yesterday? Memories, without any emotional content, have their significance; but we give to them emotional content, as like and dislike: this I will keep, that I won't keep, this I will think about, and that I will ponder over in my old age, or continue in my future. Why do we do that? Surely, that is the problem, is it not? Not that we must forget factual or psychological memories. Because, all the impressions, all the responses, everything is there, unconsciously: every incident, every thought, every sensation which you have lived through, is there—hidden, covered up, but still there. And as we grow older, we return to those memories and live in the past, or in the future, according to our conditioning. We remember the pleasant times we had when we were youthful, or we think of the future, what we are going to be.

So, we live in these memories. Why? We live as though we were different from those memories. Surely, that is the problem, is it not? We mean, by memories, words, don't we? Images, symbols, which are merely a series of sensations; and on those sensations we live. Therefore, we separate ourselves from the sensations, and say, 'I want those sensations'. Which means that the I, having separated itself from memories, gives to itself permanency. But it is not permanent. It is a fictitious permanency.

Now, this whole process of the I separating itself from memory, and giving life to that memory to response to the present, this total process obviously hinders our meeting the present, does it not? If I would

various terms we use to escape from what exactly is taking place. And, do we have to make an effort to understand what is taking place? We have to make an effort to escape when we don't want it. But when it is there, to understand it, do we have to make an effort? Obviously, we have made effort to escape, to avoid, to cover up what is; and, with that same mentality, which is to make an effort in order to avoid, in order to escape, we approach what is. Do you understand what is, with an effort? Or, must there be no effort to understand what is? So, that is one of the problems, is it not? This constant effort to avoid the understanding of what is, has become habitual with most of us, and with that same mentality of making an effort in order to escape, we say, 'All right, I'll drop all escapes and make an effort to understand what is'. Do we understand anything really, significantly, deeply, do we understand anything that has a meaning, through effort? To understand something, must there not obviously be a passivity of the mind, an alertness which is yet passive? Please, you cannot arrive at that passivity of the mind which is alert, through effort, can you? If you make an effort to be passive, you are no longer passive. If one really understands that, the significance of that, and sees the truth of it, then one will be passive. One doesn't have to make an effort.

So, when we seek, we are seeking either with the motive of escape, or of trying to be something more than what is; or else one says, 'I am all these things, I must run away'—which is unbalance, insanity. Surely, the search for truth, for the Master, is a state of insanity when the thing is there which *must* be understood before you can go further. That breeds illusion, ignorance. So, first one must find out what one is seeking, and why. Most of us know what we are seeking, and therefore it is a projection, therefore unreal; it is merely a home-made thing. Therefore, it is not truth, it is not the real.

And, in understanding this process of search, this constant making effort to be, to discipline, to deny, to assert, one must inquire into the question of what is the thinker. Is the one who makes the effort separate from the thing which he wants to be? Sorry, it may be a little difficult to pursue this, but I hope you don't mind. You have asked the question, and I am going to try to answer it.

Is the maker of effort different from the object toward which he is making effort? This is really very important; because if we can find the truth of this, we will see that there comes immediate transformation, which is essential for understanding—which is understanding, rather. Because, as long as there is a separate entity which makes the effort, as long as there is a separate entity as the experiencer, the thinker, different from the thought, from the object, from the experience, there will always be this problem of seeking, disciplining, bridging the gulf between the thought and the thinker, and so on. Whereas, if we can find the truth of this matter, whether the thinker is separate from the thought, and see the real truth of it, then there will be quite a different process at work. Therefore, you have to find out before you seek, before you find the object of your search—whether it is a Master or a cinema or any other excitement, they are all on the same level—, whether the seeker is different from the object of his search, and why he is different. Why is the maker of effort different from the thing which he wants to be? And is he different? To put it in another way: you have thoughts, and you are also the thinker. You say, 'I think I am this, and I must be that. I am greedy, or mean, or envious, or angry, I have certain habits, and I must break away from them'. Now, is the thinker different from the thought? If he is different, then the whole process must exist of making an effort to bridge, of the thinker trying to alter his thought, the thinker trying to concentrate, to avoid, resist the

microachements of other thoughts. But if he is not different, then there is complete transformation of the way one lives. So, we will have to go into that very carefully and discover—not at the verbal level at all; but experience it directly, if we can, as we go along this morning. Which is not to be mesmerized by what I am saying, or accept it, because that has no meaning; but actually to experience or oneself, whether this division is true, and why it exists.

Surely, memories are not different from the one which thinks about them. I am those memories. The memory of the way to the place where I live, the memory of my youth, the memories of both inexperienced and fulfilled desires, the memories of injuries, resentments, ambitions—all that is me, I am not separate from it. Surely, that is an obvious fact, isn't it? The me is not separate, even though you may believe that it is. Since you can think about it, it is still part of thought, and thought is the result of the past. Therefore, it is still within the net of thought, which is memory.

So, the division between the maker of effort, the seeker, the thinker, and the thought, is artificial, fictitious; and the division has been made because we see that thoughts are transient, they come and go. They have no substance in themselves, and so the thinker separates himself to give himself permanency: he exists while thoughts vary. It is a false security; and if one sees the falseness of it, actually experiences it, then there are only thought, and not the thinker and the thoughts. Then you will see—if it is an actual experience, not merely a verbal assertion nor just an amusement, a hobby—then you will find, if it is a real experiencing, that there is a complete revolution in your thinking. Then there is a real transformation, because then there is no longer a seeking for quietude or loneliness. Then there is only the concern with what is thinking, what is thought. Then you will see, if this transformation takes place, that there

is no longer an effort, but an extraordinary, alert passivity, in which there is understanding of every relationship, of every incident as it arises; therefore, the mind is always fresh to meet things anew. And hence that silence, which is so essential, is not a thing to be cultivated, but comes into being naturally when you understand this fundamental thing, that the thinker is the thought, and therefore the I is transient. Therefore, the I has no permanency; the I is not a spiritual entity. If you are able to think that the I is gone, or is something spiritual, everlasting, it is still the product of thought, and therefore of the known, therefore not true.

Therefore, it is really important, essential to understanding, to have this sense of complete integration—which cannot be forced—between the thinker and the thought. It is like a deep experience which cannot be invited; you cannot lie awake thinking about it. It must be seen immediately; and we do not see it because we are clinging to past beliefs, conditioning, what we have learned—that the I is something spiritual, more than all the thoughts. Surely, it is so obvious that whatever you think is the product of the past, of your memories, of words, sensations, of your conditioning. You cannot think about the unknown, surely; you cannot know the unknown, therefore, you cannot think about it. What you can think about is the known. Therefore, it is a projection from the past. And, one must see the significance of all this, and then there will be the experiencing of that integration between the thought and the thinker. The division has been artificially created for self-protection, and is therefore unreal. When once there is the experiencing of that integration, then there is a complete transformation with regard to our thinking, feeling, and outlook on life. Then there is only a state of experiencing, and not the experiencer apart from the experienced, which has to be altered,

modified changed. There is only a state of constant experiencing—not the core experiencing, not the center, the me, the memory, experiencing, but only a state of experiencing. We do this occasionally when we are completely absent, when the self is absent.

I do not know if you have noticed that when there is a deep experiencing of anything, there is neither the sensation of the experiencer nor the experience, but only a state of experiencing, a complete integration. When you are violently angry, you are not conscious of yourself as the experiencer. Later on, as that experience of anger fades, you become conscious of yourself being angry. Then you do something about that anger to deny it, to justify it, to condone it—you know, various forms of trying to pass it away. But if there is not the entity who is angry, but only that state of experiencing, then there is a complete transformation.

If you will experiment with this, you will see that there is this radical experiencing, this radical transformation, which is a revolution. Then the mind is quiet—not made quiet, not compelled, disciplined. Such quietness is death, is stagnation. A mind that is made quiet through discipline, through compulsion, through fear, is a dead mind. But, when there is the experiencing of that which is vital, which is essential, which is real, which is the beginning of transformation, then the mind is quiet, without any compulsion. And, when the mind is quiet, then it is capable of receiving, because you are not spending your efforts in resisting, in building barriers between yourself and reality, whatever that reality may be. All that you have read about reality, is not reality. Reality cannot be described; and if it is described, it is not the real. And, for the mind to be new, for the mind to be capable of receiving the unknown, it must be empty. The mind can be empty only when the whole content of the mind is understood. To understand the content of the mind, one must be watch-

ful, aware of every movement, of every incident, of every sensation. Therefore, self-knowledge is essential. But, if one is seeking achievement through self-knowledge, then again self-knowledge leads to self-consciousness, and there one is stuck; and it is extraordinarily difficult to withdraw from that net when once you are caught. Not to be caught in it, we must understand the process of desire, the craving to be something—not the desire for food, clothes and shelter, which is quite different, but—the psychological craving to be something, to achieve a result, to have a name, to have a position, to be powerful, or to be humble. Surely, only when the mind is empty, then only can it be useful. But a mind crowded with fears, with memories of what it has been in the past, with the sensations of past experiences—such a mind is utterly useless, is it not? Such a mind is incapable of knowing what is creation.

Surely, we must all have had experiences of those moments when the mind is absent, and suddenly there is a flash of joy, a flash of an idea, a light, a great bliss. How does that happen? It happens when the self is absent, when the process of thought, worry, memories, pursuits, is still. Therefore, creation can take place only when the mind, through self-knowledge, has come to that state when it is completely naked. All this means arduous attention, not merely indulging in verbal sensations, seeking, going from one guru to another, from teacher to teacher, doing absurd and vain rituals, repeating words, seeking Masters—all these are illusions, they have no meaning. They are hobbies. But to go into this question of self-knowledge and not be caught in self-consciousness, to go ever more deeply, more profoundly so that the mind is completely quiet—that is true religion. Then the mind is capable of receiving that which is eternal.

August 28, 1949

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS

LONDON—ENGLAND

1949

(*Verbatim Report*)

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS
LONDON—ENGLAND
1949
(Verbatim Report)

I

This is the first talk of the series, and as most of the people will not be able to come to all the talks, I will try to make each talk complete in itself, if I can.

For most of us who have problems, the difficulty lies in that we try to solve each problem on its own plane. We do not try to solve the problem integrally, as a whole, but try to solve it from a particular point of view; or we try to differentiate, or separate the problem from the total process which is life. If we have an economic problem, we try to solve it on that plane alone, disregarding the total process of life; and each problem, when so tackled, obviously must fail to be solved, because our life is not in watertight compartments: our life is a total process, psychologically as well as physiologically, and when we try to solve the psychological problems without understanding the physiological problems, we give wrong emphasis, and therefore further complicate the problem. What we have to do, it seems to me, is to take each problem, and not to deal with it as a separate issue, but as part of a whole.

So, what are our problems in life? Because, it seems to me that, if we can understand how to approach each problem rightly, we shall be able to understand not only that problem, but the whole significance of existence. And that is our difficulty, is it not?, how to approach a problem integrally, as a whole, and not keep it on a separate level, not try to look at it from one particular point of view, but to regard it as part of a whole.

How is it possible to approach a problem integrally? What is it that we mean by a problem? Because, all of us have various problems, acute or superficial, immediate or which can be postponed. We are driven by innumerable problems, subtle or

obvious; and how can we really approach them rightly, and what do we mean by a problem? And are we aware that we have problems, and how we approach them? What is our attitude towards the problem?

What do we mean by a problem? Surely, we mean a state in which there is conflict. As long as there is a conflict in us, we regard that conflict as a problem, as something to be dissolved, to be understood, to be solved, or from which we wish to escape. So, we approach a problem, a conflict, do we not?, either with a desire to escape from it, or to find an answer for it, to find a solution for it.

Now, is the solution different from the problem, or does the solution lie in understanding the problem itself, and not away from it? Obviously, those of us who want to escape from a problem have innumerable ways—drink, amusement, religious or psychological illusions, and so on. It is comparatively easy to find an escape from our problems, and shut our eyes to them, which most of us do, because we do not know how to tackle them. We always have a ready-made answer, according to our beliefs, our prejudices; according to what a teacher, a psychologist, or someone else has told us; and with that ready-made answer we try to solve, to approach the problem. Surely, that doesn't solve it. That is but another form of escape.

So it seems to me that to understand a problem requires, not a ready-made answer, not trying to seek a solution for the problem, but a direct consideration of the problem itself, which is to approach it without the desire to find an answer, if one may so put it. Then you are directly in relationship with the problem, then you are the problem; the problem is no longer separate from yourself. And I think that is the first thing one must realize, that the problem of existence, with all its complexities, is not different from ourselves. We are the problem; and as long as we regard the problem as something away

from us, or apart from us, our approach must inevitably result in failure. Whereas, if we can regard the problem as our own, as part of us, not separate from us, then perhaps we shall be able to understand it significantly—which means, essentially, does it not ?, that a problem exists because there is no self-knowledge. If I do not understand myself, the whole complexity of myself, I have no basis for thinking. "Myself" is not at any one particular level, surely. "Myself" is at all levels, at whatever level I may place it. So, as long as I have no comprehension of myself, as long as I do not understand myself fully, significantly—the conscious as well as the unconscious, the superficial as well as the hidden—obviously I have no means of approaching the problem, whether it be economic, social, psychological, or any other problem.

Self-knowledge is the beginning of understanding of the problem. Belief, ideas, knowledge, have really no significance at all without self-knowledge. Without self-knowledge they lead to illusion, to all kinds of complications and stupidities into which we can so subtly escape—and most of us do. That is why we join so many societies, so many groups, so many exclusive organizations and secret bodies. Is it not the nature of stupidity to be exclusive ? The more one is stupid, the more one is exclusive, religiously or socially ; and each exclusiveness creates its own problems.

So, it seems to me, our difficulty in understanding the many problems that confront us, both the subtle and the obvious, comes about through ignorance of ourselves. It is we who create the problem, we who are part of the environment—as well as something more, which we shall discover if we can understand ourselves. Merely to assert that we are something more, something divine, spiritual ; that there is something eternal, some spiritual essence in us—all that, it seems to me, is obviously an illu-

sion, because it is mere verbalization of something which you do not know. You may have a feeling, a sensation ; but that is not factual. What is a fact must be discovered, must be experienced. But, to experience something deeply, fundamentally, there must be no belief ; because, what you experience then, is merely conditioned by your belief. Belief creates its own experience ; therefore, such an experience is not true. It is merely the conditioned response to a challenge.

So, to understand the innumerable problems that each one of us has, is it not essential that there be self-knowledge ? And that is one of the most difficult things, to be self-aware—which does not mean en isolation, a withdrawal. Obviously, to know oneself is essential ; but to know oneself does not imply a withdrawal from relationship. And it would be a mistake, surely, to think that one can know oneself significantly, completely, fully, through isolation, through exclusion, or by going to some psychologist, or to some priest ; or that one can learn self-knowledge through a book. Self-knowledge is obviously a process, not an end in itself ; and to know oneself, one must be aware of oneself in action, which is relationship. You discover yourself, not in isolation, not in withdrawal, but in relationship—in relationship to society, to your wife, your husband, your brother, to man ; but to discover how you react, what your responses are, requires an extraordinary alertness of mind, a keenness of perception.

So, as any problem is the result of a total process, and not an exclusive, isolated result, to understand it, we must understand the total process of ourselves ; and to understand ourselves—not only superficially, in one or two layers of the upper mind, but through the whole content of consciousness, the whole content of our being—to understand that fully, significantly, it must be perceived and experienced in relationship. We can

either make that relationship exclusive, narrow, limited, and thereby hinder our self-knowledge; or we can look at, be aware of, that relationship as a whole, as the means of self-discovery. Surely, only in relationship the process of what I am, unfolds, does it not? Relationship is a mirror in which I see myself as I am; but as most of us do not like what we are, we begin to discipline, either positively or negatively, what we perceive in the mirror of relationship. That is, I discover something in relationship, in the action of relationship, and I do not like it. So, I begin to modify what I do not like, what I perceive as being unpleasant. I want to change it—which means, I already have a pattern of what I should be. The moment there is a pattern of what I should be, there is no comprehension of what I am. The moment I have a picture of what I want to be, or what I should be, or what I ought not to be—a standard according to which I want to change myself—then, surely, there is no comprehension of what I am at the moment of relationship.

I think it is really important to understand this, for, I think this is where most of us go astray. We do not want to know what we actually are at a given moment in relationship. If we are concerned merely with self-improvement, there is no comprehension of ourselves, of what is. You are merely concerned with achieving results; and to achieve a result is in the end an awful bore, because it leads nowhere. But to know what I am, not what I should be, is extremely arduous; because the mind is so subtle, so eager to avoid anything which is. And so it has developed various standards, patterns, assumptions, which deny what is. So, to understand oneself, which is not a dead thing, but a living thing, your approach must be actively new, and therefore, it cannot have the positive or the negative assertion of a standard.

So, to understand oneself—which can be done only in relationship, not

outside relationship—, there must be no condemnation. If I condemn something, I do not understand it; or if I accept something, I do not understand it. Acceptance is merely identification with the problem, and denial or condemnation is another form of identification. But, if we can look at the problem without condemnation or justification—that is, the problem of myself as I am in relationship, which is action—, then there is a possibility of understanding what is, and therefore, unfolding what is.

So, as our problems are the result of the total process of ourselves, which is action in relationship, whether with things, ideas or people, it is essential, is it not?, that there should be understanding of ourselves. Without knowing myself, I have no real basis for thinking. I can think, or at least I think I can think. I may have opinions, I may have innumerable beliefs, I may belong to this society, to that organization or church, have immense knowledge. Surely, all that is not a basis for right thinking. It leads to illusion. It leads to further conflict, further confusion. So, to think rightly, it is essential, is it not?, that there be self-knowledge; which is to know yourself as you are from moment to moment, to be aware of everything that is going on, of all the inward responses to every outward challenge, to every experience. But you cannot know yourself fully, completely, deeply, extensively, if there is any form of belief, any form of adherence to an experience of yesterday. To understand something, you need a fresh mind—not a mind that is prejudiced, not a mind that is clogged with experience; because to understand yourself, there must be self-discovery. Obviously, discovery can only be from moment to moment, therefore, there must be no continuity—not merely thought which is conditioned to a particular pattern, however noble, or however absurd and stupid.

So, it is not very easy to be aware of the whole significance of a parti-

cular experience, which is relationship. It requires an extraordinarily alert, keen mind ; but a mind is made dull by clinging to an experience of yesterday ; a mind is made dull by belief. As I said, experience according to belief, merely conditions the mind ; and such an experience, though very satisfactory, gratifying, obviously limits the extraordinary, extensive self-knowledge which comes through awareness of the response in relationship ; because, if you have an experience and you cling to that experience, which is memory, and with that conditioned thought, with that memory, you approach a new challenge, obviously there is no comprehension of that challenge. And relationship, surely, is challenge, is it not ? Relationship is not a static thing. And, because we are not capable of meeting that challenge adequately, fully, we have problems. Because we are nationalists, Catholics, Protestants, Buddhists, or God knows what else, or because we belong to this society or that group, which are all limiting we are incapable of meeting a challenge which is constantly arising ; for to meet a challenge, there must be complete self-knowledge. And to rely on memory, on a past experience, as a means of discovering ourselves, obviously limits our thinking, our perception. Because, after all, what is it that most of us are seeking ? Though we have our problems, though we are worried economically, though there is immense insecurity, wars, the nuisance of nationalism, the exclusiveness of innumerable cults, religions, and our own desire to be exclusive—in spite of all these stupidities, what is it that we are actually seeking ? If we can know that, perhaps we shall be able to understand. Because, we seek according to our age, according to the period and circumstances of our lives.

Do we not seek, through all this confusion, something permanent, something lasting, something which we call real, God, truth, what you

like ?—the name doesn't matter, the word is not the thing, surely. So don't let us be caught in words. Leave that to the professional lecturers. There is surely a search for something permanent, is there not ?, in most of us—something we can cling to, something which will give us assurance, a hope, a lasting enthusiasm, a lasting certainty ; because in ourselves we are so uncertain. We do not know ourselves. We know a lot about facts, what the books have said ; but we do not know for ourselves, we do not have a direct experience.

And what is it that we call permanent ? What is it that we are seeking, which will, or which we hope will give us permanency ? Are we not seeking lasting happiness, lasting gratification, lasting certainty ? We want something that will endure everlasting, which will gratify us. If we strip ourselves of all the words and phrases, and actually look at it, this is what we want. We want permanent pleasure, permanent gratification—which we call truth, God, or what you will.

So, we want pleasure. Perhaps that may be putting it very crudely, but that is actually what we want—knowledge that will give us pleasure, experience that will give us pleasure, a gratification that will not wither away by tomorrow. And we have experimented with various gratifications, and they have all faded away ; and we hope now to find permanent gratification in reality, in God. Surely, that is what we are all seeking—the clever ones and the stupid ones, the theorist and the factual person who is striving after something. And is there permanent gratification ? Is there something which will endure ?

Now, if you seek permanent gratification, calling it God, or truth, or what you will—the name does not matter—surely you must understand, must you not ?, the thing you are seeking. When you say, "I am seeking permanent happiness"—God, or

truth, or what you like—, must you not also understand the thing that is searching, the searcher, the seeker ? Because, there may be no such thing as permanent security, permanent happiness. Truth may be something entirely different ; and I think it is utterly different from what you can see, conceive, formulate. So, before we seek something permanent, is it not obviously necessary to understand the seeker ? Is the seeker different from the thing he seeks ? When you say, "I am seeking happiness," is the seeker different from the object of his search ? Is the thinker different from the thought ? Are they not a joint phenomenon, rather than separate processes ? Therefore, it is essential, is it not ?, to understand the seeker, before you try to find out what it is he is seeking.

And that is why it seems to me so essential, so important, to understand oneself ; because in oneself is the whole problem and the whole issue. To stipulate, to formulate, that you are the end, that you are the absolute, that you are God, this or that, is obviously a verbalization which gives you an escape, and through which you do escape. To say that you are, or you are not, the real or the false, has no meaning ; because, you have no basis for any such thinking, and you can think rightly only when you know yourself. To know yourself, you must be completely aware of every movement of thought ; then, in that awareness, you will find out whether the thinker is different from his thought. If he is different, then we have the many complex problems of how to control the thought, and then begin all the stupidities of disciplining—the meditations, the approximation of the thinker to the thought. But is there a thinker different from his thoughts ? Is not the thinker, the thought ? They are not separate, but a unitary process. Therefore we are thought, not the thinker thinking thoughts. And this must be a direct experience, this realization that the thinker is the

thought ; and when there is such an experience, then we will see that there is a possibility of going beyond thought.

Because, after all, thought is merely the response of memory ; and what memory creates, fabricates, projects, is not the real. God is not the result of memory, of education, of belonging to this society or that society, or believing in this or in that dogma. Those are all merely the results of thought, which is the response of memory of experience. But to find out if there is reality, if there is such a thing as God, obviously it is essential to understand oneself first, and not to speculate if there is God, or if there is not ; for all speculation is a waste of time.

So, to understand the problems which confront each one of us, however complex, however subtle, surely, one must understand that they are not something outside of us, outside of our thinking—but that these problems are the process or the result of ourselves. The world is us, not separated from us. The world's problem is my problem, your problem, not something to be dealt with, apart. And to resolve these problems—not superficially, not temporarily, but fundamentally, lastingly—, there must be comprehension of oneself ; and to understand oneself, there must be echoless awareness in relationship. Then, one perceives oneself as one is ; and then one can go into it more fully, deeply. But if you cover up what you are, by condemnation, or by approximation, identification, then there is no understanding, then the process of self-knowledge is limited. Only in understanding oneself completely and fully, both the conscious as well as the unconscious ; only when the mind is still, not mad still—only then, is there a possibility of discovering or experiencing—or knowing the real.

That is why meditation is important ; but not the meditation that most of us indulge in, which is merely compulsion, or approximation to an

idea, or disciplining in order to make the mind still—which is infantile, because the mind cannot be made still. Who is it that makes the mind still? Such effort leads to illusion, which we will deal with another time. But when the mind is still, not through compulsion, not through any form of approximation; when it is not compelled, not forced, not made to conform; when the mind is really still through understanding its own process—then only is there a possibility of discovering that which is eternal. Then you don't have to seek truth; to seek truth is to deny truth, because truth cannot be sought after: it must come to you. And it can come only when the mind is quiet—not made quiet, but is quiet. And there is quietness, there is tranquillity, there is stillness, only through self-knowledge.

I have been given a few questions, and I will try to answer some of them.

Question: Is there going to be another war, and how soon?

KRISHNAMURTI: You want a prediction from me?! So you may safeguard your investments?! Now why do we ask such a question? Don't you know if there is going to be a war or not? Not from the newspapers, not from your political leaders—for, after all, you choose your leaders according to your confusion: the more you are confused, the more leaders you have; the less confused you are and the clearer you are in yourself, which is not through your learning, the fewer leaders you need. So, don't you know for yourself, if there is going to be a war or not?

What do we mean by war? War is not only the dramatic, spectacular bloodshed; that is the ultimate. But aren't we continuously at war with ourselves, and therefore with our environment, with our neighbours? Surely, you don't have to be told that we are at war. What we are, that

we make the world to be. War is inevitable so long as we are nationalistic: so long as you are English and I am Hindu, there is sure to be war. As long as there are frontiers, sovereign governments, separate armies, there is bound to be war. As long as there are social, economic divisions, the exclusiveness of different castes and classes, there is bound to be war.

We all know this. Perhaps you may read one or two history books and have a superficial knowledge of history. These are the obvious causes of war: when one nation wants to be superior to another nation, one group feels inferior to another group; when there is prejudice—the white and the black and the brown and the purple, or whatever it is. How do you think all this comes about? Obviously, what we are, we project. The world is the result of ourselves, of our self-projection. So, there will be war as long as you are nationalistic, as long as you are exclusive in your beliefs, though you may be "tolerant." Tolerance is a thing of the mind, invented by the clever people: when you love, you do not "tolerate." Only when you and I are no longer bound to castes, to classes; only when we are not bound to any form of religion, organized belief, whether it is small or large; only when we are no longer greedy for power, for position, for authority, for comfort—only then will there be peace. Peace is not a result of legislation; peace isn't going to be brought about by the United Nations. How can outside law make you peaceful? How can an outside compulsion make you love? And if you rely on an outside authority to make you peaceful, to make you kind, non-greedy, then you are looking to something which will never come into being. So, war—whether on the physical or on a different level of consciousness, it is all the same—, conflict is inevitable, as long as you and I are striving after our own particular security through nationalism, through belief, through

illusions. We are merely perpetuating conflict in ourselves, and so outwardly.

You see, we all know these things. Every preacher on the corner talks about them. But we are not peaceful; we haven't stopped being greedy. Though we may not be greedy for money, we are greedy for more things, more power, more self-expansion, wishing to be something, now, or at some future date. This whole sense of hierarchical, social development, or inward development—all this, obviously indicates a process which will eventually result in conflict, in war, in destruction and misery. We all know these things, but yet we don't ask why they continue to exist. Surely, that is much more important, to find out why we don't live the things which we feel. Probably we don't feel them. Probably we are merely living on the verbal level, saying, "There must be no war. We will all believe in brotherhood, join various organizations that believe in brotherhood." But inwardly we are as corrupt as the person who sits in an office and plans war—because we want to be somebody, in the family, in a group, in society, in the nation. We want power. We are not content to be as nothing, because we are so carried away by the desire for outward stimulants, outward show, because inwardly we are empty—and of that we are so frightened. Therefore, we pile up possessions, either of ideas or of things. And it is only when we are content to be as nothing—which is not fundamentally the contentment of satisfaction, of sluggishness, lethargy, stupidity—, only when we are content with what is, which requires an extraordinary understanding of all the escapes: only then will there be peace.

Question: What is prejudice? How can one really overcome it? What is the state of mind free from all prejudices?

KRISHNAMURTI: Can you overcome a prejudice? To overcome something is to reconquer it again and again. Can you really overcome a prejudice? Or is this overcoming merely a substitution of one prejudice for another? Surely, our problem is not how to overcome p.e.ud.ce—because then we are merely seeking a substitution; it is to understand the whole process of prejudice, what are the implications of prejudice, not merely verbally, on the verbal level of the mind, but fundamentally, deeply. Then there is a possibility of being free from prejudice. But if you are striving to overcome one prejudice, or various prejudices, then you are merely seeking to overcome a pain which you call prejudice, a hindrance which you call prejudice.

Now, what do we mean by prejudice? When is there freedom from prejudice? How does prejudice come into being? One way, obviously, is through so-called education. History books are full of prejudice. All religious literature is full of it—the instilled belief; and that belief, which is created, manufactured from childhood, grows into prejudice. You are this, and I am that. You are Protestant, and I am Hindu. Therefore, my belief and your belief come into conflict. You try to proselytize me, convert me, and I am going to try to do the same. Or we are "tolerant": you hold to your belief, I hold to mine, and we try to be friendly. That is, I live in my fortress of prejudice, and you live in yours, and we look over it and try to be friends, which is called "tolerance"; but it is really intolerance. It is really the most absurd form of trying to be friends. How can we be friends, how can we have real affection, if I am living in my prejudice and you are living in yours?

So we know the various causes of prejudice—ignorance, purposely cultivated, creates prejudices through education, through environmental influences, through religion, and so on; and there is our own desire to

II

Probably most of us have definite views, or we have come to definite conclusions from which it is very difficult to deviate or to look at another point of view; because most of us have lived quite painfully, have suffered, and we have come to certain points of view which we find difficult to change; and if we listen to another at all, we listen through the screen of our own conclusions, of our own experiences, of our own knowledge, and so it is extremely difficult to understand another fully and completely. And, if I may suggest, we should, for the time being, or at least for this morning, put aside our particular conclusions and points of view, and try to consider together the problems that confront us. Our difficulty is going to be that we want conclusions, we want answers to the various problems. But, if we can examine each problem that arises, sufficiently intelligently, which means without being bound by conclusions, without definite opinions, then perhaps we shall be able to understand the problem fully, integrally.

One of the problems in our life is, is it not ?, that of the individual and his relationship to the State. Perhaps, if we can understand the whole process of the individual, then we shall be able to understand our relationship, not only to the one or two, but to the many, to the mass, to the country, to the people as a whole. So, this division between the State and the individual seems to me to be erroneous; because, after all, what we are, we make the State to be. We project that which each one of us is. This may seem to be a very simple philosophy, a very simple idea, and not worth-while examining; because, our minds are so complicated, we have read so much, we are so intelligent, so clever, that we cannot think of a problem simply. But, it seems to me, we must think of this highly complex problem very directly and

simply; because, after all, a complex problem can be understood fully, only when we approach it negatively. And in understanding the individual and his process, we shall perhaps understand the relationship of the individual to the State, or to the mass, or to another individual.

So, to me, the problem of the relationship of the individual to the State can be understood only when we understand the process of the individual; because, without the individual, the State is not. There is no such thing as the mass. It is a political implement convenient for various purposes, for exploitation, and so on. And also, for most of us, when we talk about the mass, it is a convenient way of disposing of people; because, to look at an individual, to look at another, requires a great deal of attention, thought, consideration, which we are unwilling to give; and therefore, we call them the mass—and the mass is ourselves, you and me.

To understand the whole projection which we call society, with all its complexities, surely we have to understand ourselves. But most of us are unwilling to understand ourselves; because that is a tedious job, unexciting, and we think it has not much significance, that the understanding of oneself will lead nowhere. Whereas, if we can work, help to bring about certain reformations, certain alterations in society, that, perhaps, will be worth-while. And also, there is the impression that in understanding ourselves we will inevitably be self-centred, self-enclosed.

Surely, fully to understand oneself and the whole process of what the individual is, requires, not isolation, not a withdrawal, but the understanding of relationship; because, after all, all action is relationship: there is no action without relationship. And, if in my relationship with another there is antagonism, greed, envy, if there are all the various causes that bring about conflict, surely, I will create a society which

will be the result of that relationship. So, the understanding of myself is not an egocentric process; on the contrary, it requires an awareness of relationship. Therefore, relationship is the mirror in which I discover myself, I see myself—whether it be the relationship with the one or with the many, with society. And if I want a radical transformation in society, I must obviously understand myself.

This may sound rather childish and infantile, without much significance; but I do not think it is so easy, nor so easily brushed off.

You may say, "What can the individual do to affect history?" Can he do anything by his life? I don't think you are going to stop wars immediately, or bring about a better understanding between the various peoples. But, at least in the world I live in, in the world of my immediate relationship—whether it is with my boss, with my wife, with my children, or with a neighbour—there, at least, I can bring about a certain reformation, a certain transformation, a certain understanding. I may not be able to bring about understanding with the Russians, or the Germans, or the Hindus; but at least in the world I am living in, there can be a certain peace, a certain happiness, a certain love, affection, and all the rest of it. And I think, though it may not widely affect the world at large, at least I can be a nucleus, a centre of different value, of different understanding and significance; and perhaps that may gradually bring about a transformation in the world.

But, surely, we are not principally concerned with the transformation of the world, because what I do, what you do, will have little effect. But, if I can stop being greedy—not superficially but profoundly—if I can stop being ambitious, then perhaps I shall be able to bring a new breath, a new understanding, to life. And surely, that is the most effective and direct action, is it not?—to bring about transformation, a radical change, in oneself; for, after all, that

is how all great movements are started, with the individual, with oneself. So, my relationship—or your relationship, the relationship of the individual—to the State can be understood, and a change in that relationship brought about, only when I understand the total process of myself.

Do not, please, brush this aside, saying, "This is infantile, stupid; it has no effect in the world." What has a fundamental effect in the world? A mass movement? Or, is that fundamental effect brought about by a few creative people who are not self-centred, egotistic, self-enclosed, who do not project their interests and ambitions, a few who are really free of their egotism?

So, to understand this, one must know the process, one must be aware of oneself in action, which is relationship. In understanding what we are, we shall find the solution to the many problems that confront us, understanding not only what we are, superficially, on the upper levels of the mind, but knowing the whole content of oneself, the hidden as well as the open, the superficial as well as the many layers of our consciousness, of which at present we are unaware. Perhaps we are aware of them at rare moments; but to bring all the hidden into the conscious and so dissolve the personal, egotistic, narrow intentions and pursuits, thereby establishing right relationship, seems to me of the utmost importance. That is the only thing which I feel is worthwhile discussing, talking about, and living; how to be free of greed, not only superficially, but inwardly. Because, that is one of the causes of conflict, is it not?—greed, not only for things, possessions, but greed for power, greed for knowledge, greed for prestige. And to understand greed requires, surely, a great deal of attention—not to find out who is greedy, or to imitate the pattern of a person who is not greedy, but to be aware of oneself as being greedy, and to follow and understand every implication of that greed. Because, obviously,

greed has social effect: individuals being greedy, seeking power, bring about a group or a nation that is equally greedy for power, position, prestige, which creates wars.

Is it possible to be free from greed, and live in a society which is nothing but the result of greed, of violence? I think that question can be answered only through direct experience; not verbally trying to be free from greed, but when we know the experience, the true experience, of non-greed. After all, greed expresses itself in so many ways—the greed for truth, the greed for position, the greed for happiness, and the greed for things, for security. Is outward, physical security denied when there is no inward, psychological security? Is it not possible to live in this world without each one seeking his own security? After all, each one of us is seeking psychological security much more than physical security. We use possessions, things, outward security, as a means of psychological security. When the physical needs become a psychological necessity, then that psychological necessity destroys outward security. We can think this out—it is so obvious. As long as I am using things, possessions, property, as a means of self-expression, as a means of aggressive, self-projecting existence, then the needs become all-important; then things, property, become all-dominant; because I am using things, property, for my inward psychological security.

And why do we want to be inwardly secure? It is essential to be outwardly, materially secure, otherwise we cannot live; you and I could not be here if I hadn't my normal food and you hadn't yours. We must have outward security. But I feel that our security is denied, is destroyed, when we use the outward security as a means of inward expansion, of inward pursuit of greed; because then we use things, not as necessities, but we give to them psychological significance. Property then becomes for us a means of psychological survi-

val. After all, the titles, positions, degrees, wealth are used as a means, are they not?, of psychological survival, psychological certainty, security; and as long as we seek psychological security through things, there must be contention about things?

Is it possible to live in relationship, without being inwardly secure, psychologically certain? After all, that is what we mean by the words "certain," "secure." Most of us are seeking psychological security, are we not?, apart from physical security. We must have physical security, much or little, depending on our environment, and so on. But need there be psychological security? Do we want it? Though we are seeking it, though our eternal pursuit is to be secure inwardly, is that not a wrong process, a wrong approach to life? Is there inward security? You and I may want it—but is there such a thing as inward security? When I want to be certain in relationship—whether it be with an idea, with a person, or with a thing—do I find security in that relationship, inward certainty in that relationship?

And, if I am secure in my relationship, is it a relationship? If I am sure of you as my wife, or my boss, or my friend—sure in the sense of using you as a means of my inward security—is there a relationship between us? Is there any relationship between you and me when I use you? As long as I am using you as a means of my inward security, what is our relationship? You are only a useful instrument for me. I am not related to you. You are a piece of furniture, to be used. That is, inwardly, psychologically, I am poor, empty, insufficient; so, I use you as a means of covering myself up, as a means of escape from myself. And such usage we call love, or what you will.

This escape we call relationship, whether it is relationship with property, with people, or with ideas. And, surely, such a relationship must inevitably create conflict, sorrow, and disaster. And that is the state we

live in—using people, things, as a means of covering up our own inward poverty. Therefore, the things that we use become all-important; the person, the possession, the idea, the belief, become all-important; because, without them we are lost: therefore, more knowledge, more people, more things. And yet, that which we are, we have never understood. And it seems to me, as long as we are seeking psychological security, we shall never understand ourselves. But, when we are aware that we are using people, things, ideas, for our own escape from ourselves, being aware of that escape, surely brings about a different relationship. Then the person, the idea, or the thing is no longer important in itself. Therefore, we are not so attached to things, to people; then there is an intelligent approach to the question of property. But I cannot approach it intelligently as long as I am using property as a means of covering up my inward poverty; because, as long as we are attached to things, we are those things. As long as you are attached to property, you are the property, you are not a spiritual entity: that is just a lot of phony talk. As long as you are attached to a belief, you are that belief. As long as you are attached to a person, you are that person. And we are attached so desperately, because in ourselves we are empty, in ourselves we are nothing; being afraid of that emptiness we hold on to outward things, to ideas, to ideals which are self-projected.

So, this question of relationship cannot be understood superficially, or verbally, or read about in books; but the whole significance of it, with its intricacies and its extraordinary depth, can be understood only when we are aware of our relationship with each other. And what that relationship is, society is. Merely to talk about brotherhood has no meaning without understanding oneself. You may join societies, form groups for brotherhood; but as long as you are

using a society, or people, or things, as a means of your inward security, you are bound to create more conflict, more illusion, more pain in the world, which is what is happening, just as nationalism, used as a means of covering up one's own poverty and of identifying oneself with a particular country, leads to war.

What is important is to understand oneself, and to come face to face with oneself, with that poverty which we are avoiding, that emptiness which we all shun. And when we understand that, really experience it, without condemnation, when we are fully related to that emptiness, then only is there a possibility of going beyond and discovering what is true, or what is God.

There are several questions, and I will try to answer some of them.

Question : I have tried very hard, but cannot stop drinking. What should I do ?

KRISHNAMURTI : You know, each one of us has various escapes. You take a drink, and I follow a Master. You are addicted to knowledge, and I to amusement. All escapes are similar, are they not ?, whether one takes to drink, follows a Master, or is addicted to knowledge. They are all the same, surely, because the intention, the purpose, is to escape. Perhaps drinking may have a social value, or may be more harmful; but I am not at all sure that the ideational escapes are not worse. They are much more subtle, more hidden, and more difficult to be aware of. A man addicted to rituals, ceremonies, is no different from the man addicted to drink, because both are trying to escape through stimulants.

And I think it is possible to stop escapes only when you are aware that you are escaping, that you are using all these things—drink, Masters, ceremonies, knowledge, love of country, what you will—as stimulants, sensations, to get away from your-

self. After all, there are various ways to stop drinking. But if you merely stop drinking, you will take up something else. You may become a nationalist, or pursue some teacher on the other side of the world, or become ideationally fanciful.

Surely, the reason for escape is obvious: we are dissatisfied with ourselves, with our state, outwardly and inwardly. And so we have many escapes; and we think we shall understand, dissolve the escape, the drinking, when we discover the cause. When we know the cause of escape, do we stop escaping? When I know that I am drinking because I am quarrelling with my wife, or because I have a rotten job—when I know the cause, do I stop drinking? Surely not. I stop drinking only when I establish right relationship with my wife, with another, and remove the conflict which is causing pain.

That is, to put it differently, as long as I am seeking self-fulfilment, in which there is frustration, there must be an escape. As long as I am frustrated, I must find an escape. When I want to be something—a politician, a leader, the pupil of a Master, anything—as long as I want to be something, I am inviting frustration; and as being frustrated is painful, I seek an escape from it, whether it is a drink, or a Master, or a ceremony, or becoming a politician—it doesn't matter what it is, they are all the same.

So, then, the question arises, is there self-fulfilment? Can the self, the me, be something, become something? And what is the me which wants to become something? The me is a bundle of memories, a chain of memories in reaction with the present; I am the result of the past in conjunction with the present. And that me wants to perpetuate itself, through family, through a name, through property, through ideas. The me is merely an idea, an idea which is satisfying, giving sensations, and to that the mind clings; the mind is that.

And as long as the mind is seeking fulfilment as the me, obviously there must be frustration, as long as I give importance to myself as being something, there must be frustration; as long as I am the centre of everything, of my thoughts, my reactions: as long as I give myself importance, there must be frustration. Therefore, there must be pain, and from that pain we try to escape, through innumerable ways. And the means of escape are similar.

So, don't let us worry over the means of escape—whether yours is superior to mine. What is important is to realize that as long as one is seeking fulfilment in the self, there must be misery, strife; and this misery cannot be avoided as long as the self is important, the me is important.

So, you will say, "What has drinking got to do with all this? You haven't answered my question, how to stop drinking." I think the problem of drinking, as any other problem, can be understood and put an end to, only when I understand the process of myself, when there is self-knowledge. And that understanding of oneself requires constant watchfulness—not a conclusion, not something you can hold on to, but constant awareness of every movement of thought and feeling. And, to be so aware is tiresome, and so we say, "Oh, it isn't worth it." We push it aside, and therefore increase the sorrow, the pain. But surely, only in understanding oneself as a total process, do we solve the innumerable problems that we have.

Question: I find it impossible to believe in God. I am a scientist, and yet my science gives me no satisfaction. I cannot bring myself to believe in anything. Is this merely a matter of conditioning? If so, is faith in God more real? How can I come to that faith?

KRISHNAMURTI: Why do we believe? What is the necessity of

believing? Which doesn't mean that you must not believe—that is not the problem. Why do we believe? And believing can only condition experience. Surely, what I believe, that I experience. If I believe in God, that I will experience. But such experience is not reality; it is only a self-projected experience.

So, it is important, is it not?, to find out why we believe; and through belief, can we find anything? Can we discover something? Or, is a mind capable of discovering only when it is not held, tethered to a belief, to a conclusion? But why do we believe in God? Obviously, it is because we see that everything about us is transient, everything about us is changing, being destroyed, coming to an end—our thoughts, our feelings, our existence; and we want something permanent, lasting, enduring. Either we create that permanency in ourselves, calling it the soul, the *Atman*, or what you like; or we project that demand for permanency into an idea which we call God.

Ideas can never be permanent. I may like an idea to be permanent, but in itself it is not permanent. I may want permanency; but as long as I am wanting it, I am creating a permanency which is non-existent. And belief, faith in God, is merely the reaction, the response, of a person who is seeking permanency. Therefore, his belief conditions his experience. He says, "I know there is God. I have experienced that extraordinary feeling." But surely, such experience, based on the desire for permanency, is a self-projected experience, and therefore not an experience of reality. And, what is real can be found only when there is no longer any question of seeking security, permanency, that is, when the mind is utterly still and free from all want.

So, as long as we believe, we can never find. Therefore, to find what is real, what is God—whatever name you like to call it—there must be

"... freedom from fear, freedom

from the desire to be inwardly secure, freedom from that fear of the unknown. And only then, surely, is it possible to experience whatever that something is, to know if there is such a thing as God. But a man who believes in God, or a man who does not believe in God, if he holds on to that conclusion, is obviously caught in an illusion. I can know that something, understand it, experience it directly, only when I am not self-enclosed, when I am not conditioned by belief, by fear, by greed, by envy, and so on.

Belief, then, obviously destroys the experiencing of reality. And it is very difficult to think that way, because most of us are so conditioned in belief—the scientist as well as you and I; because we all find satisfaction in belief. And if I do not find satisfaction in things, in people, in ideas, then I create a super-idea, which is God. And to that I cling, because that is much more satisfying, more gratifying. So, the search for gratification must inevitably create barriers, and to these barriers we cling. You are a believer or a non-believer; but if you and I really want to understand if there is reality, if there is God, if there is something not fabricated by the mind, not the result of sensation or the search for sensation—if we want to find such a thing, then we must understand the process of sensation. Because, belief gives us sensation, as does drink, and to these sensations we cling; and these sensations are self-projected. We make from our minds the image of God, and to that we cling.

But, if you and I would really experience that thing which is not nameable, which is not of time, we cannot cling to beliefs, which are self-projected images; because, anything which is named is not the real, it is the outcome of memory, of our conditioning; and if it is of time, then it is still part of the mind, for the mind is the result of the past, of the various influences, social, environmental, educational, and so on. So,

if we understand the process of time, of naming, if we understand the conditions which exist in us, the influences in which we are caught, that understanding brings about a tranquillity of the mind. As I said, mind is not made still. When you make the mind still, then it is a dead mind. When you discipline the mind to be quiet, though it may be superficially quiet, it is still in a state of agitation, like a child being put in a corner. But when we understand the whole process of belief, the stimulants, the desire to be secure, the search for permanency; when we understand the truth of all these things, fully, not just superficially or verbally, but actually experience it—then the mind is quiet, you don't have to make the mind quiet. It is no use to make the mind quiet. You are the mind; you are the thinker as well as the thought. But if the thinker separates himself and tries to control his thought, that leads to illusion.

So, then, you see all this, understand it, experience it directly—then the mind is quiet. And in that quietness you will know if there is God, reality, or if there isn't: in that stillness, in that silence, you will know. Before that, to speculate on God or no God, on whether you are following the right Master or not—all that seems to me so childish, immature. But the experiencing of reality is not a thing that can be imagined, that can be speculated upon. It is only in the state of experiencing that you will find the real; but to seek faith as a means of stimulation, as an escape from our daily existence of relationship, must inevitably lead to illusion, at whatever level you may like to place that illusion.

So, obviously, to discover, there must be freedom, freedom from greed; and whether you are a scientist, and I a layman, or whether I am ignorant and you full of knowledge, we can find that reality only when we understand ourselves. And in the understanding of ourselves comes tranquillity, for self-knowledge brings

wisdom. And it is only in wisdom that there is tranquillity—not in knowledge, not in intellectual amusement and ideations. There is no tranquillity in ideas. And that tranquillity comes into being, only when the mind is no longer pursuing its own projections. The experiencing of reality is not a thing to be handed to one: no Master, no saviour, can give it to you. It comes into being only with the depth of our own understanding of ourselves.

Question : If what you talk about is so rare, and apparently only for a few once in a while, what is the purpose of your talking to us? Can you really help us, the mass?

KRISHNAMURTI : I think the purpose of my talking is very clear—at least, to me. First, I am not talking in order to exploit you. I am not getting a kick out of it, nor do I feel lost if I do not talk. It isn't that. I talk for a simple reason: because I feel that you and I can help each other to understand our problems—and not because I feel that I am a superior person, who has achieved something or other. By talking over the innumerable problems that we have—the problems of relationship, for there are no other problems—we can understand them. We can talk them over quietly, free of any bias; or, being biased, prejudiced, we can be aware of that bias and prejudice.

After all, we are trying to establish a relationship between us, you and I. If I am using you, or you are using me, we have no relationship. Then you exploit me and I exploit you. But if each one of us is trying to understand the problem which is oneself, then we shall establish right relationship. Then, perhaps, when we discuss—not intellectually, not verbally—we can explore ourselves, we can see ourselves as we are; because, after all, relationship is a mirror in which I see myself as I am—that is, if I want to see myself. But,

as most of us dislike to see what is, we make relationship a farce. Relationship then becomes an escape.

If you do not want to escape through me, or I through you, then it is possible, in understanding the various problems together, to see ourselves as we are, whether we are one or many. To me, there is no such thing as the mass. The mass is you and me. We think we understand people when we call them Germans, Russians, English, or Hindus. It is a lazy mind that does that, a slack mind that says, "Oh, you are a Hindu," or, "You are English." Because, it is so much easier, isn't it ?, to call someone by a name, and then to think, "I understand him." But if I do not call you by a name, I have to look at you much more closely; I have to see your face, to study your individual movements of thought. I have to be aware of you as an individual. But if I treat you as the mass, then I can bomb you very easily, destroy you.

So, to help another, I must see the other, not as 'being this or that, belonging to this nationality or to that, but to see him as he is. I cannot see him as he is, If I am myself caught in my own petty nationalism, in my own societies, beliefs, and ridiculous superstitions, my own nonsense. So, to understand each other we must look at each other very clearly—that is, to understand you, I must know myself: I must see myself very clearly in my relationship with you. And then only is there a possibility of our helping each other.

October 9, 1949

III

I think it is fairly obvious that to understand a complex, and especially a psychological problem, requires a very quiet mind, a mind that is still, but not with an enforced stillness;

a mind that is peaceful, silent, so that it is capable of understanding directly the complex problem and its answer.

What prevents this quietness of mind is obviously conflict. Most of us are in such turmoil, worried about so many things, anxious about life, death, security, and our relationships. There is constant agitation; and it is extremely difficult, naturally, for a mind that is so agitated to understand the ever-increasing social as well as psychological problems. And it is essential, is it not ?, that to understand a problem completely, there should be a silent mind, a mind that is not biased, a mind that is capable of being free, still, and allowing the problem to reveal itself, unfold itself. And such a quiet mind is not possible, when there is conflict.

Now, what makes for conflict? Why are we in such conflict, each one of us, and so society, and so the State and the whole world ? Why? From what does conflict arise ? When conflict ceases, obviously there can be a peaceful mind; but a mind that is caught in conflict cannot be tranquil. And, desiring tranquillity, a certain sense of peace, we try to escape from conflict through every kind of means—social service, losing ourselves in some ritual, or in some kind of activity, mental and otherwise. But, obviously, escapes lead to illusion, and to further conflict. Escapes only lead to isolation, and therefore to greater resistance. And, if one did not escape, or if one were aware of the escapes, and therefore were capable of understanding directly the process of conflict, then perhaps there would be a quietness of the mind.

And I think it is essential to see that a tranquil mind is necessary—but not a tranquillity that is forced, that remains in isolation, enclosed; not a tranquillity that is attached to one particular idea, and therefore is enclosed, held in that idea, or in a belief. Such tranquillity is not reality; it is death, because there is no creative process in its self-enclosed isolation.

So, if we could understand the process of conflict, and how it arises, then perhaps there would be a possibility of the mind being free, quiet. But, the difficulty in understanding conflict is, that most of us are so eager to get away from it, to go beyond conflict, to find a way out of it, to find the cause of it; and I do not think that merely looking for the cause, or discovering the cause of conflict, is going to resolve conflict. But, if one can understand the total process of conflict, see conflict from every point of view, psychological as well as physiological; if one can have patience to investigate silently, without any condemnation or justification—then perhaps it will be possible to understand conflict.

After all, conflict arises, does it not ?, through desire to be something, to be other than what is. This constant desire to be something other than what is, is one of the ways of conflict: which does not mean that we should be content with what is—one never is. But to understand what is, we must understand this desire to be something other than what is. I am something—ugly, greedy, envious—and I want to be something else, the opposite to what is. Surely, that is one of the causes of conflict, these opposing and contradictory desires, of which we are made up.

I think that merely looking at conflict, being aware of its process, is in itself freeing. That is, if we are aware, without any friction, without any choice, merely aware of what is; and if we are also aware of the desire to run away from what is, into the self-projected ideal (and all ideals are home-made, and therefore fictitious, unreal); if we are merely aware of all that, then that very awareness will bring about a tranquillity of the mind. And then you can proceed with what is; then there is a possibility of understanding what is.

But, surely, conflict is much more significant than the mere friction between opposites. Conflict arises, does it not ?, through approximation

of action to an idea. We are always trying to approximate action to a belief, to an ideal, to an idea. I have an idea of what I should be, of what the State should be, and I'm trying to live up to that ideal. Therefore, conflict arises when there is the attempt to bridge idea and action. But, is it possible to bridge idea and action ? Action is real, is actual, isn't it ? Without action I cannot live. But why should I try to conform action to an idea ? Is idea more real than action ? Has idea more substance than action ? Is idea truer than action ? And yet, if we watch ourselves, all our action is based on idea. We have the idea first, and then there is action. Only rarely is there action which is spontaneous, free, without the idea encompassing it.

So, why is there this division between idea and action ? If we can understand that, perhaps we may be able radically to put an end to conflict; because, conflict is obviously not the way to understanding. If I quarrel with you, if I am in conflict with you, with my wife, with society, with my neighbours, close by or far away, there can be no understanding. Does understanding come through the struggle between thesis and antithesis, between the opposites ? Does synthesis come through conflict ? Or, is there understanding when there is no conflict ? That understanding we try to translate through action, from which again arises conflict. To put it differently, when there is creativeness, when we have that creative feeling, there is no struggle, there is absence of struggle, which means that the self, the me, with all its prejudices, its conditioning, is not there. In that state, when the self is not, there is creativeness; and that creative feeling, that creative state, we try to express in action, through music, painting, or what you will. Then the struggle begins—the desire for recognition, and so on.

Surely, the creative state does not demand struggle; on the contrary,

when there is struggle, there is no creative state. When the self, the me, is totally absent, then there is a possibility for that creative state to come into being. And as long as idea predominates, there must be struggle, there must be conflict. That is, to shape action according to idea, must further conflict. So, if we can understand why idea predominates in our minds, then perhaps we shall be able to approach action differently.

Most of us are concerned with how to live according to an idea. We have the idea first—how to be noble, how to be good, how to be spiritual, and all the rest of it—and then try to live according to it. Why do we do this? We first establish a mental pattern, which we call the idea, or the ideal, and according to that we try to live. Why? Is not the whole process of ideation brought about through the me, the I, the self? Is not the self, the me, an idea? There is no me apart from the idea of the me. The me creates the pattern. The me is an idea, and according to that idea we live, we try to act.

So, the idea is primarily, is it not?, the outcome of the importance of the self. And, having established the importance of the me and the mine, the pattern of behaviour, we try to live according to that. Therefore, idea controls action, idea impedes action. Take, for instance, generosity, complete generosity—not the generosity of mind, but of heart. If one lived according to that, it would be very dangerous, wouldn't it? If one were to act completely generously, it would lead to all kinds of friction with existing standards. So, the idea intervenes, controls generosity. And it is safer to live according to the idea of generosity, than according to the generosity of the heart.

So, when idea predominates, it is obvious that we are seeking security, safety, comfort, exclusion, isolation—and are therefore creating more friction. Because, nothing can live in isolation: to be, is to be related. Idea brings isolation, and action does not.

And our conflict is always between idea and action. And I think that, if we can understand this process of ideation, if we can understand ourselves, not superficially, but the whole process of ourselves, the conscious as well as the unconscious, then perhaps we shall understand this conflict. After all, conflict arises because the me is important—the me which is identified with the country, with the particular belief, with the particular name or family. That is the source of all conflict, is it not?—because the me is ever seeking isolation, exclusion. Action based on the idea of exclusion must inevitably create conflict, from which we try to escape, consciously or unconsciously; and therefore conflict is increased.

So, to understand conflict, it is important, it seems to me, to know the whole process of one's thinking, and to be aware of how actually, in daily life, we are trying to approximate action to an idea. And, can one live without idea? Can one live without the self? Really and basically it comes to that—can one live in this monstrously ugly, conflicting world, without the thought of me? I think this can be answered actually, not theoretically, only when one understands the process of the me, what makes up the me. One sees that these tortuous ways, the contradictions, the denials, the approximations, all belong to the self-projected pattern of an idea. So, in knowing oneself totally—not at any one level of consciousness, but as a total process that is going on constantly—in being aware of that, there does come about a freedom from the self; and only then is it possible for the mind to be silent.

Only when the self is absent, is there a possibility for the mind to be quiet, and therefore be able to understand, able to receive that which is eternal. But to make a picture of eternity, to conceive an idea of it, or to hold to a belief about it, is really self-projection; it is merely an illusion, it has no reality. But, for the

timeless to be, the workings, the fabrications, the projections of the self must, obviously, entirely cease. And the cessation of that self-projection is the beginning of meditation, is it not?—because understanding oneself is the beginning of meditation; and without meditation there is no possibility of understanding the self. Without understanding the process of the self, there is no basis for thought, there is no basis for right thinking. Merely to approximate action to an idea or to an ideal, is utterly vain. Whereas, if we can understand ourselves in action, which is relationship in daily life: relationship with one's wife, one's husband, the way one talks to one's servant, the snobbishness, the nationalism, the prejudices, the greeds and the envies of every-day life; not the self, placed at a higher level, which is still within the field of thought, and therefore still part of self—to be aware of all this action in relationship is the beginning of meditation. And in understanding this action of the self, surely, there is tranquillity. Only when the mind is really quiet, not made quiet; only when it is not compelled, not conforming, but is quiet—only then—is there a possibility of discovering that which is eternal.

Question: Would you tell us what, according to you, is the truth which will free us? What is meant by your statement, "Truth must come to you, you cannot seek it"?

KRISHNAMURTI: Surely, by understanding what is false, what is illusion, what is ignorance, truth comes into being, does it not? You don't have to seek it; because thought is the instrument with which you are seeking. If I am greedy, envious, prejudiced, and I try to seek truth, obviously my truth will be the result of greed, envy, prejudice—therefore it is not truth. All that I can do, is to see what is false, to be aware that I am conditioned, that I am greedy,

that I am envious. That is all I can do—to be aware of it choicelessly. Then, when I am so aware, and therefore free from greed, truth comes into being. But if we seek truth, the result obviously will be illusion. How can you seek truth? Truth must be something unknown to a mind that is caught in the false—and we are; because we are conditioned, psychologically as well as physiologically, and a conditioned mind, do what it will, cannot possibly measure the immeasurable.

These are not just words. You can see the truth of it, if you are really willing to listen rightly. How can I, when I am conditioned by belief, by fear, by my nationalism, by my prejudices, and in innumerable ways by greed and envy—how can I see the truth? If I do, it will be a self-projection. What the self seeks, is obviously its own creation, therefore untrue. And seeing the truth of this, the truth of what I have just now said, is already a liberating process, is it not?—merely to see it, to be aware that greed cannot find; envy cannot find, that which is true. Merely to observe it, to see it, to silently be aware of it, will bring about not only release from greed, but the realization of what is true.

So, those who are trying to seek truth, will obviously be caught in illusion; and therefore, truth must come to you, you cannot go after it, you cannot chase it. Because, after all, what is it we all want? We want gratification, we want comfort, we want inward security, peace—and that is what we are seeking. We call it truth, we give it a name. Therefore, what we are seeking in different forms, at different levels, is gratification, not truth. Truth can come into being only when the desire for gratification, for security, has come to an end—which is extremely arduous; and as most of us are lazy, sluggish, we pretend to seek truth, and form societies and organizations around it.

So, all that we can do, is to be aware of our own appetites, desires,

and vanities—it does not matter at what level you may place them: to be aware of all that, and to be free of it, which means to be free of the self, the me. Then, you do not have to seek truth; then truth will come to you, because the field is there—a mind that is quiet, undisturbed by its own agitations. Such a mind is capable of receiving. It must be negatively aware, passively aware—which again is very, very arduous, because the mind wants to be something; it wants a result, an achievement. And if it has failed in one direction, it will seek success in another. That success it calls the search for truth. Whereas, truth is the unknown, it must be discovered from moment to moment, not in some abstraction, not in some isolated action, but in every moment of our daily existence. To see the false as the false, is the beginning of the truth—the false in our speech, the false in our relationships, the little appetites, the little vanities, the barbarities which we indulge in. To see the truth of the falseness of all that, is the beginning of the perception of what is true.

But you see, most of us do not want to be so aware. It is tiresome. We'd rather escape into some illusion, into some belief, in which we can find isolation and consolation—it's so much easier; and in that isolation we say that we seek truth. It is not possible to find truth in isolation. It is not possible, being psychologically secure, certain, for the great uncertainty of truth to come into being. So, all that we can do, if we are really serious, earnestly interested, is to give truth an opportunity to come into being by understanding our relationship with things, with people, with ideas. Then, understanding brings freedom; and in that freedom alone can there be the real.

Question: Your teachings some years ago were understandable and inspiring. You then spoke earnestly about evolution, the path, discipleship,

and the Masters. Now it is all different. I am utterly bewildered. I readily believed you then, and would like to believe you now. I am confused. Which is the truth—what you said then, or what you say now?

KRISHNAMURTI: This really needs serious consideration; and I hope those of you who are bored with this kind of stuff will listen patiently.

First of all, it's not a question of belief. You don't have to believe what I say—far from it. If you believe what I say, then it is your misery, not mine; then you will use me as another authority, and therefore take shelter, comfort. But what I am saying is merely, that without self-knowledge, without knowing yourself, there can be no understanding of life. That does not demand belief. It demands watchfulness on your part—not belief in what I say. So, let us be very clear on that point, because, I think, that to believe is a hindrance to the understanding of truth—which does not mean that you must become an atheist, which is another form of belief. But to understand the total process of believing, of why you believe, is the beginning of wisdom.

We believe because we want to hold on to something, because we want security; we are so uncertain in ourselves, we are so discontented, we are so inwardly poor, that we want something rich to hold on to. As the wordly man holds on to property, so the so-called believer holds on to his belief—there is not much difference between the two. Both want security, both want comfort, both want certainty. And these beliefs are self-projected, and therefore do not lead to reality.

Now, the questioner wants to know why I have changed. At one time, some years ago, I talked of Masters, discipleship, progress, spiritual growth, and all that kind of thing. And now I do not. Why? Where has the change come, and what has produced it?—isn't that the basis

of the question? And he wants to know which to believe: those things which I said previously, or what I am saying now.

What was said previously, demanded belief. After all, you need a belief about the Masters. You can rationalize that belief, but still it is a belief. And it's very convenient to have such a belief, especially when the Master is somewhere far away—because then you can play with that idea. But if you have a *guru*, a teacher, directly in relationship with you physically, then it's much more difficult, isn't it?—because he will criticize you, he will watch over you, he will tell you off—which is much more painful. Whereas, to have a Master in India, or in the Himalayas, or on some mountain far away from all our daily life, is very convenient, very encouraging. And such a thing needs belief. It is a self-projected idea. And that gives you comfort; because then you can postpone action, then you can say, "Well, I'll be like him in my next life. It will take me a long time to be free from greed"—and that you call evolution. Surely, greed is not a thing to be postponed; either you are free from greed now, or you will never be. To say that you will become free from greed some day, is the continuation of greed. And the idea that someone is looking after you, patting you on the back, encouraging you, showing special interest in you, while you discipline yourself according to him, according to the ideals laid down by him—all this is obviously puffing up the self. Naturally, it gives you encouragement, it gives you inspiration, to think that someone is looking after you, that you have all eternity in front of you to be something, that the path is a thing to tread slowly, taking your time, and that one day you will arrive.

All such thoughts and beliefs are very encouraging and inspiring. That's why societies are formed for people who want to be encouraged. Such a process, to me, is the way of

exploitation—because you like to be exploited by the Master, or by the representative of the Master; and you choose the representative according to your desires and gratifications. When you are being gratified, it's very inspiring—at least, you call it inspiring; it's really another form of sensation.

Now, when you see all that as being false, utterly without any basis; when you see that nothing can lead you to the truth except your own understanding of yourself, that no Master can give you the light save yourself—then it's not so inspiring, not so encouraging, because to know oneself demands watchfulness, alertness, constant vigilance; and it is rather boring, tiresome, depressing, to know that one is ugly. But to be told there is something in you which is eternal, marvellous—that you like. And so you follow the Master, and accept all the illusions that go with it. Then it gives you satisfaction; and that is, after all, what most of us are seeking—not truth, not to understand what is false, but to be gratified. And as you seek certainty, security, in the physical world, so you carry that over into the psychological, spiritual world. But there is no security in the psychological world. If you seek security, then there is illusion; for it is only in great uncertainty that you find.

Now, when you see all that, obviously you put those things away from you. You no longer play with them. And what I say now is not the other side of the coin—it has nothing to do with those things, which are false. To understand oneself, is the beginning of wisdom. When you see that which is false, you are already beginning to see that which is true. Obviously, this whole structure of self-expansion, with spiritual degrees of discipleship, the ladder of hierarchical achievement, is utterly false; because, that which is true, has no divisions. But we like divisions; we like exclusions; socially we like to be called by a title. And you

carry the same snobbishness into the other world. But when one sees this whole process as being self-expansive, giving importance to the me, to the mine, giving prestige to myself, then, surely, it fades away; you don't have to struggle against it. It's like seeing something poisonous: it has no attraction, it is no longer true, therefore, you no longer belong to that way of thinking.

You see, all this implies that one must stand alone. But most of us are afraid to be alone—not alone in the sense of isolation, but alone in the sense of seeing something as it is, seeing the false as the false and the true as the true. To see the false as the false, when everybody is seeing what is false as the true, needs certain choiceless awareness. And, as most of us dread to be alone, quiet, free from all self-projected illusions, we cling to things made by the mind. Without understanding yourself, do what you will, invent any theory, any Master, follow any discipline—it will not lead to happiness. You may deceive yourself—by saying, "What you say and what I believe are the same. They're the two sides of the coin." You may say what you like; but that is mere self-deception. But to go into this whole problem of the self, to see all its ways, its deceptions and illusions, its comforts—to know oneself so completely—brings tranquillity of the mind, which another cannot give you. Then, in that tranquillity, that which is eternal, can be.

Question: How is one to be free of the constant fear of death?

KRISHNAMURTI: What is it that creates fear? Why is one afraid of death? If you don't mind, let us experiment with this—not only with what I have said previously, but with this also. You see, while most of us are afraid of death, we also know why. Obviously, we don't want to come to an end. We know the body

is going to perish, be destroyed like any other thing which is used constantly. But, psychologically, we don't want to come to an end. Why?

Because we don't want to come to an end, we have rationalized innumerable theories: that we will continue in the hereafter, that there is reincarnation, that some kind of self continues, and so on. But still, in spite of all these rationalized beliefs, convictions and determinations, there is fear. Why? Is it not because we want certainty of the unknown? We don't know what is after death. We would like to continue with all our qualities, with all our achievements, with all our identifications. We seek permanency, which we call immortality. We seek permanency in this world through name, property, possessions, family, and so on—which is an obvious thing we are doing all the time. And we also want to continue in another realm of thought, of feeling—in the psychological world, the spiritual world.

What is it that continues? Idea, thought, is it not? The idea of yourself as a name, as a particular identified individual—which is still an idea, which is memory, which means the word. So, thought, mind, identifying itself as memory, as the word, as the name, wants to continue. Surely, most of us are clinging to that, aren't we? in different ways. As I grow older, I look back upon life, or I look forward with fear to death. So, we want to continue, in some form or other. And, being uncertain of that continuity, we are afraid. You are not afraid of leaving your family, your children; that is just an excuse. Actually, you're afraid to come to an end.

Now, that which continues, that which has continuity—can that be creative? Is there a renewal in that which continues? Surely, there is renewal only in that which comes to an end. Where there is an ending, there is a rebirth—but not in that which continues. If I continue as I am, as I have been in this life, with

all my ignorance, prejudices, stupidities, illusions, memories, and attachments—what have I? And yet it is to that, we cling so tenaciously.

Surely, in ending there is renewal, is there not? It's only in death that a new thing comes into being. I am not giving you comfort. This is not something to be believed or thought about, or intellectually examined and accepted—for then you will make it into another comfort, as you now believe in reincarnation, or continuity in the hereafter, and so on. But the actual fact is, that that which continues has no rebirth, no renewal. Therefore, in dying every day there is renewal, there is a rebirth. That is immortality. In death there is immortality—not the death of which you are afraid, but the death of previous conclusions, memories, experiences, with which you are identified as the me. In the dying of the me every minute there is eternity, there is immortality, there is a thing to be experienced—not to be speculated upon or lectured about, as you do about reincarnation and all that kind of stuff. Only when you come to an end as the me, when you cease to be attached to your family, to your properties, to your ideas—only then is there immortality; which does not mean that you become indifferent, callous, or irresponsible.

When you are no longer afraid, because every minute there is an ending and therefore a renewal, then you are open to the unknown. Reality is the unknown. Death is also the unknown. But to call death beautiful, to say how marvellous it is, because we shall continue in the hereafter and all that nonsense has no reality. What has reality, is seeing death as it is—an ending; an ending in which there is renewal, a rebirth, not a continuity. For, that which continues, decays; and that which has the power to renew itself, is eternal. But a mind that is attached, possessed, can never renew itself. Therefore, such a mind is afraid of the unknown, of the future. Fear ceases

only when there is constant renewal, which means constant death. But most of us do not want to die that way. We like to be attached to our furniture and properties, to our beliefs, to our so-called loved ones. We want to continue in that state, with our conflicts, with our experiences, with our attachments. And, when all that is threatened, we are frightened. And so there are innumerable books written about death. You're more interested in death than in living; whereas, in understanding living, that is, yourself in constant relationship; in seeing the false as the false, and therefore dying every minute, not in theory, but actually, to the things to which you are attached, to beliefs, to memories—only then is there renewal in which there is no death.

October 16, 1949

IV

For the past few weeks we have been discussing the problem of self-awareness and self-knowledge. It is so obviously essential to know oneself completely. And to know oneself, is not a withdrawal from life, but rather, the understanding of relationship—relationship with things, with people, with ideas. And, experience can be understood only through self-knowledge; experience is not apart from self-knowledge.

Unfortunately, most of us do not seek self-knowledge, but cling to experience. And we use experience as a measure to discover truth, to discover reality, or God, or what you will. So experience, with most of us, has become the standard of valuation.

But does experience reveal truth, or whatever name you like to call it? Surely, experience is a distraction, a process away from oneself. That is, most of us are so unaware of the total process of our existence; we do not see that we are running away

from ourselves. In ourselves, whether we admit it or not, consciously or unconsciously, there is a state of poverty, an emptiness, which we try to cover up, from which we try to run away. And in the process of covering it up, we have various experiences; we cling to various points of view, beliefs. And these distractions, which are obviously away from ourselves, are experiences. That is, one is aware, consciously or unconsciously, of a sense of emptiness in oneself, a sense of being nothing, a sense of being insufficient. Most of us are aware of it; but we are not willing to face it, not willing to understand what it is; we try to run away from that state of emptiness, that state of nothingness, either through holding on to property, through name, through position or family, through people, or through knowledge. This flight from ourselves is called experience; and, to these escapes we cling, and therefore the means of escape become much more important than the understanding of ourselves. The means of escape from our own state offer happiness, and therefore experience becomes a hindrance to the understanding of what is.

That is, to put it differently, most of us are aware that we are lonely; and to escape from that loneliness, we turn on the radio, or read a book, or cling to a person, or become addicted to knowledge. This escape from what is, gives us various experiences; and to these experiences we cling. Then property, name, position, prestige, become extraordinarily important. Similarly, the person becomes important, whether the one or the many, the individual or the group, the society. And likewise knowledge, as a means of escape from ourselves, becomes extraordinarily important.

So, we cover up that emptiness, that loneliness, through knowledge, through relationship, and through possessions; therefore, possessions, relationships, and knowledge become dinary important—because

without them we should be lost. Without them we are face to face with ourselves as we are; and to escape from that, we resort to all these means, and are caught in the experiences of these escapes. We use those experiences as a standard, as a measure, to discover reality. But reality, or God, is the unknown; it cannot be measured by our experience, by our conditioning; and to come to it, we must put aside all escapes and face what is—which is our loneliness, our extraordinary sense of being nothing. We are empty, though we do not like to acknowledge it; and we have therefore surrounded ourselves with things through which we escape from ourselves.

So, experience is not a measure, is not the way to reality; because, after all, we experience according to our belief, according to our conditioning; and that belief is obviously an escape from ourselves. To know myself, I need not have any belief: I only have to watch myself, clearly and choicelessly—watch myself in relationship, watch myself in escape, watch myself in attachment. And one has to watch oneself without any prejudice, without any conclusion, without any determination. In that passive awareness, one discovers this extraordinary sense of aloneness. I am sure most of you have felt this—the sense of complete emptiness which nothing can fill. It is only in abiding in that state, when all values have utterly ceased; it is only when we are capable of being alone and facing that aloneness without any sense of escape, only then, does reality come into being—because, values are merely the result of our conditioning; like experience, they are based on a belief, and are a hindrance to the understanding of reality.

But, that is an arduous task, which most of us are unwilling to go through. So we cling to experiences—mystical, superstitious, the experiences of relationship, of so-called love, and the experiences of posses-

sion. These become very significant, because it is of these that we are made. We are made of beliefs, of conditionings, of environmental influences; that is our background. And from that background, we judge, we value. And when one goes through, understands, the whole process of this background, then one comes to a point where one is utterly alone. One must be alone to find reality—which does not mean escape, withdrawal from life. On the contrary, it is the complete intensification of life; because, then there is freedom from the background, from the memory of the experiences of escape. In that aloneness, in that loneliness, there is no choice, there is no fear of what is. Fear arises only when we are unwilling to acknowledge or see what is.

Therefore, it is essential for reality to come into being, to set aside the innumerable escapes that one has established, in which one is caught up. After all, if you observe, you will see how we use people—how we use our husbands and wives, or groups, or nationalities—to escape from ourselves. We seek comfort in relationship. Such a search for comfort in relationship brings certain experiences, and to those experiences we cling. Also, to escape from ourselves, knowledge becomes extraordinarily important; but knowledge is obviously not the way to reality. Mind must be completely empty and still, for reality to come into being. But a mind that is rattling around with knowledge, addicted to ideas and beliefs, ever chattering, is incapable of receiving that which is. Similarly, if we seek comfort in relationship, then relationship is an avoidance of ourselves. After all, in relationship we want comfort, we want something to lean on, we want support, we want to be loved, we want to be possessed—which all indicates the poverty of our own being. Similarly, our desire for property, for name, for titles, for possessions, indicates that inward insufficiency.

When one realises that this is not the way to reality, then one comes to that state when the mind is no longer seeking comfort, when the mind is completely content with what is—which does not mean stagnation. In the flight from what is, there is death; in the recognition and awareness of what is, there is life. So, experience based on conditioning, the experience of a belief, which is the result of escape from ourselves, and the experience of relationship—these become a hindrance, a block; they cover up our insufficiencies. And it is only when we recognise that these things are an escape, and therefore see their true value—only then—is there a possibility of remaining quiet, still, in that emptiness, in that loneliness. And when the mind is very quiet, neither accepting nor rejecting, being passively aware of that which is, then, there is a possibility for that immeasurable reality to be.

Question : Is there, or is there not, a Divine Plan? What is the sense of our striving if there is not one?

KRISHNAMURTI : Why do we strive? And what are we striving after? What would happen if we did not strive? Would we stagnate and decay? What is this constant striving to be something? What does this strife, this effort, indicate? And, does understanding come through effort, through striving? One is constantly striving to become better, to change oneself, to fit oneself to a certain pattern, to become something—from the clerk to the manager, from the manager to the divine. And, does this striving bring understanding?

I think the question of effort should really be understood. What is it that is making the effort, and what do we mean by "the will to be"? We make an effort, do we not?, in order to achieve a result, in order to become better, in order to be more virtuous, or less of something else. There is this constant battle going on

in us between positive and negative desires, one superseding the other, one desire controlling the other—only we call it the higher and the lower self. But, obviously, it is still desire. You can place it at any level, and give it a different name; it is still desire, a craving to be something. There is also the constant strife within oneself and with others, with society.

Now, does this conflict of desires bring understanding? Does the conflict of opposites, the want and the non-want, bring clarification? And is there understanding in the struggle to approximate ourselves to an idea? So, the problem is not the strife, the struggle, or what would happen if we did not struggle, if we did not make an effort, if we did not strive to be something, psychologically as well as outwardly; the problem is, how does understanding come into being? Because, when once there is understanding, there is no strife. What you understand, of that you are free.

How does understanding come into being? I do not know. If you have ever noticed that the more you struggle to understand, the less you understand any problem. But, the moment you cease to struggle and let the problem tell you the whole story, give all its significance, then there is understanding; which means, obviously, that to understand, the mind must be quiet. The mind must be choicelessly, passively, aware; and in that state, there is understanding of the many problems of our life.

The questioner wants to know if there is, or if there is not, a Divine Plan. I do not know what you mean by a "Divine Plan." But we do know, do we not?, that we are in sorrow, that we are in confusion, that confusion and sorrow are ever on the increase, socially, psychologically, individually and collectively. It is what we have made of this world. Whether there is a Divine Plan or not, is not important at all. But what is important is, to understand the con-

fusion in which we live, outwardly as well as inwardly. And to understand that confusion, we must begin, obviously, with ourselves—because we are confusion; it is we who have produced this outward confusion in the world. And to clear up that confusion, we must begin with ourselves; because, what we are, the world is.

Now, you will say, "Well, it will take a very long time in this way to bring about order in the world." I'm not at all sure that you are right; because, after all, it's one or two who are very clear, who understand, that bring about a revolution, a change. But we are lazy, you see; that is the difficulty. We want others to change, we want circumstances to change, we want the Government to order our lives, or some miracle to take place that will transform us. And so, we abide with confusion.

So, what is really important, is not to inquire if there is or if there is not a 'Divine Plan'; because, over that you will waste speculative hours, proving that there is or there is not. That becomes a game for the propagandists. But what is important, is really to free oneself from confusion; and that does not take a long period of time. What is essential is to see that one is confused, that all activity, all action which springs from confusion, must be confused also. It's like a confused person seeking a leader: his leader must also be confused. So, what is essential, is to see that one is confused, and not try to escape from it, not try to find explanations for it: be passively, choicelessly, aware. And then you will see, that quite a different action springs from that passive awareness; because, if you make an effort to clarify the state of confusion, what you create will still be confused. But, if you are aware of yourself, choicelessly, passively aware, then that confusion unfolds, and fades away.

You will see, if you will experiment with this—and it will not take a long period of time, because time is not involved in it at all—that

clarification comes into being. But you must give your whole attention, your whole interest, to it. And I am not at all sure that most of us do not like to be confused—because in the state of confusion you need not act. And so we are satisfied with the confusion; because, to understand confusion, demands action which is not the pursuit of an ideal or an ideation.

So, the question whether there is, or whether there is not, a Divine Plan, is irrelevant. We have to understand ourselves and the world we have created: the misery, the confusion, the conflict, the wars, the divisions, the exploitations. All that is the result of ourselves in relationship with others. And if we can understand ourselves in relationship with others, if we can see how we use others, how we try to escape from ourselves through people, through property, through knowledge, and therefore give immense significance to relationship, to property, to knowledge—if we can see all that, be aware of it passively, then we shall be free from that background which we are. Then only is there a possibility of finding out what is. But, to spend hours speculating whether there is a Divine Plan or not, striving to find out about it, lecturing about it, seems to me so infantile. For, peace does not come into being through conformity to any plan, whether the plan is left, right, or divine. Conformity is mere suppression, and in suppression there is fear. Only in understanding can there be peace and tranquillity; and in that tranquillity, reality comes into being.

Question : Does understanding come to one suddenly unrelated to past effort and experience?

KRISHNAMURTI : What do we mean by past experience? How do you experience a challenge? After all, life is a process of challenge and response, is it not?—the challenge

always being new, otherwise it is not a challenge. And our response is inevitably the outcome of the background, of our conditioning. So, the response, if it is not adequate, full, complete with regard to the challenge, must create friction, must create conflict. It is this conflict between the challenge and the response that we call experience. I do not know if you have ever noticed that, if your response to the challenge is complete, there is only a state of experiencing, not the remembrance of an experience. But, when the response is not adequate to the challenge, then we cling to the memory of the experience.

It is not so difficult; don't be so puzzled. Let us explore it a little more, and you will see. As I said, life is a process of challenge and response—at all levels, not at one particular level; and as long as that response is not adequate to the challenge, there must be conflict. Surely, that is obvious. And conflict invariably prevents understanding. Through conflict, one cannot understand any problem, can one? If I am constantly quarrelling with my neighbour, with my wife, with my associates, it is not possible to understand that relationship. It is possible to understand only when there is no conflict.

And does understanding come suddenly? That is, can conflict cease suddenly? Or, must one go through innumerable conflicts, understanding each conflict, and then be free of all conflict? That is, to put the problem differently, behind this question I'm sure there is another question: "Since you have been through the various fogs, confusions, conflicts, belief in Masters, in reincarnation, the various societies, and so on and so on, must I not also go through them? Since you have been through certain phases, must I not also go through those phases, in order to be free?" That is, must we not all experience confusion, in order to be free of confusion?

So, the problem is, is it not?

understanding come through following or accepting certain patterns, and living through those patterns in order to be free? Say, for example, at one time you believed in certain ideas; but now, you have pushed them aside, you are free and have understanding. And I come along and see that you have lived through certain beliefs, and have pushed them aside and gained understanding. So, I say to myself, "I will also follow those beliefs, or accept those beliefs, and eventually I will come to understanding." Surely, that is a wrong process, is it not? What is important is to understand. Is understanding a matter of time? Surely not. If you are interested in something, there is no question of time. Your whole being is there, concentrated, completely absorbed in that thing. And it is only when you want to gain a result that the question of time comes in. So, if you treat understanding as an end to be gained, then you require time, then you talk about "immediate" or "postponed." But, understanding, surely, is not an end-process. Understanding comes when you are quiet, when the mind is still. And if you see the necessity of the mind being still, then immediately there is understanding.

Question: What, according to you, is true meditation?

KRISHNAMURTI: Now, what is the purpose of meditation? And what do we mean by meditation? I do not know if you have meditated; so, let us experiment together to find out what is true meditation. Don't listen merely to my expression of it; but together we'll find out and experience what is true meditation. Because, meditation is important, isn't it? If you do not know what is right meditation, there is no self-knowledge; and without knowing yourself, meditation has no meaning. To sit in a corner or walk about in the garden or in the street, and try

to meditate, has no meaning. That only leads to a peculiar concentration, which is exclusion. I'm sure some of you have tried all those methods. That is, you try to concentrate on a particular object, try to force the mind, when it is wandering all over the place, to be concentrated; and when that fails, you pray.

So, if one really wants to understand what is right meditation, one must find out what are the false things which we have called meditation. Obviously, concentration is not meditation—because, if you observe, in the process of concentration there is exclusion, and therefore there is distraction. You are trying to concentrate on something, and your mind is wandering off towards something else; and there is this constant battle going on to be fixed on one point, while the mind refuses and wanders off. And so we spend years trying to concentrate, to learn concentration, which is mistakenly called meditation.

Then there is the question of prayer. Prayer obviously produces results, otherwise millions wouldn't pray. And in praying, obviously the mind is made quiet: by constant repetition of certain phrases, the mind does become quiet. And in that quietness there is a certain intimation, certain perceptions, certain responses. But, that is still a part of the trick of the mind—because, after all, through a form of mesmerism you can make the mind very quiet. And in that quietness there are certain hidden responses arising from the unconscious and from outside the consciousness. But, it is still a state in which there is no understanding.

And, meditation is not devotion—devotion to an idea, to a picture, to a principle; because, the things of the mind are still idolatrous. One may not worship a statue, considering it idolatrous and silly, superstitious; but one does worship, as most people do, the things of the mind: and that is also idolatrous. And, to be devoted to a picture or an idea, to a Master,

is not meditation. Obviously, it's a form of escape from oneself. It's a very comforting escape, but it's still an escape.

And this constant striving to become virtuous, to acquire virtue through discipline, through careful examination of oneself, and so on, is obviously not meditation either. Most of us are caught in these processes; and since they do not give understanding of ourselves, they are not the way of right meditation. After all, without understanding yourself, what basis have you for right thinking? All that you will do, without that understanding of yourself, is to conform to the background, to the response of your conditioning. And such response to the conditioning is not meditation. But to be aware of those responses, that is, to be aware of the movements of thought and feeling, without any sense of condemnation, so that the movements of the self, the ways of the self, are completely understood—that way is the way of right meditation.

Meditation is not a withdrawal from life. Meditation is a process of understanding oneself. And when one begins to understand oneself, not only the conscious but all the hidden parts of oneself as well, then there comes tranquillity. A mind that is made still, through meditation, through compulsion, through conformity, is not still. It is a stagnant mind. It is not a mind that is alert, passive, capable of creative receptivity. Meditation demands constant watchfulness, constant awareness of every word, every thought and feeling, which reveals the state of our own being, the hidden as well as the superficial; and as that is arduous, we escape into every kind of comforting, deceptive thing, and call it meditation.

If one can see that self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation, then the problem becomes extraordinarily interesting and vital. Because, after all, if there is no self-knowledge, you may practise what you call medita-

tion and still be attached to your principles, to your family, to your property; or, giving up your property, you may be attached to an idea and be so concentrated on it that you create more and more of that idea. Surely, that is not meditation. So, self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation; without self-knowledge there is no meditation. And as one goes deeper into the question of self-knowledge, not only does the upper mind become tranquil, quiet, but the different layers of the hidden are revealed. When the superficial mind is quiet, then the unconscious, the hidden layers of consciousness project themselves; they reveal their content, they give their intimations; so that the whole process of one's being is completely understood.

So, the mind becomes extremely quiet—is quiet. It is not made quiet, it is not compelled to be quiet by a reward, by fear. Then there is a silence in which reality comes into being. But that silence is not Christian silence, or Hindu silence, or Buddhist silence. That silence is silence, not named. Therefore, if you follow the path of Christian silence, or Hindu or Buddhist, you will never be silent. Therefore, a man who would find reality must abandon his condition completely—whether Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, or of any other group. Merely to strengthen the background, through meditation, through conformity, brings about stagnation of the mind, dullness of the mind; and I'm not at all sure that's not what most of us want—because it's so much easier to create a pattern and follow it. But to be free of the background demands constant watchfulness in relationship.

And, when once that silence is, then there is an extraordinary, creative state—not that you must write poems, paint pictures: you may or you may not. But that silence is not to be pursued, copied, imitated—then it ceases to be silence. You cannot come to it through any path. It comes into being, only when the ways of the

self are understood, and the self, with all its activities and mischief, comes to an end. That is, when the mind ceases to create, then there is creation. Therefore, the mind must become simple, must become quiet, must be quiet—the "must" is wrong: to say the mind must be quiet, implies compulsion. And the mind is quiet only when the whole process of the self has come to an end. When all the ways of the self are understood, and therefore the activities of the self have come to an end—then only is there silence. That silence is true meditation; and in that silence the eternal comes into being.

October 23, 1949

V

It must seem very difficult for most of us to bring about a real transformation within ourselves. We see the necessity of real, deep, radical revolution, both inwardly and in outward things; and it is obvious that this transformation should be, not momentary, but constant. We want to bring about changes in the world—economic changes, social changes, and so on; but it seems to me, that one cannot really bring about a significant outward change, unless there is a radical psychological revolution, transformation. For the inner, surely, always overcomes the outer. What one is, that one creates outwardly. And unless this transformation takes place, mere outward reforms, outward changes, however carefully worked out, will inevitably fail, because the thing that is missing, is this inward revolution, this inward transformation.

And how is this inner transformation to be brought about? If we can really discuss it this morning, we may see that it is not so impossible, that it is not just for the few, but for those who are really serious and

earnest. And what do we mean by this revolution, by this transformation within? Because, if there is no inner transformation, one can see that whatever one may do outwardly, whatever social reforms one may bring about, will inevitably fail. Unless the inner motives, desires, impulses, are understood, they overpower the outward structure.

So, it is essential to begin within oneself, to bring about the transformation in one's own attitude, actions and direction. That transformation, surely, must begin with self-knowledge; because without self-knowledge, there can be no radical revolution. Revolution is not according to an idea, according to a pattern; then, it is not a revolution—it is merely a modified continuity. But, if one can understand the psychological process of oneself, the inward demands, pursuits, fears, ambitions, hopes; and if one can go through the whole process of them—then it is possible to bring about a transformation. And therefore it is necessary, surely, to understand oneself, before one can bring about a transformation, outwardly or inwardly.

Now, this study of oneself cannot take place without understanding relationship. And as I've been saying over and over again, it is only in relationship that one begins to see the ways of the self—the self at whatever level one may place it; because, relationship is the fundamental issue, is it not? Without understanding relationship, the relationship between yourself and another, and without bringing about a radical transformation there, mere attempts at social revolution will inevitably fail, because our whole existence is based on relationship—the relationship between yourself and your wife, between yourself and your neighbour, and therefore the relationships of society as a whole. It is there that there must be transformation. And, there cannot be transformation in relationship if the self is not fully investigated and understood—because the self

is obviously the source of all conflict. One may give full expression to that self, thinking that it is the only thing one has; but it will invariably bring conflict and confusion in relationship. And it is only in understanding relationship that there can be transformation. So, transformation must surely begin with relationship, and not merely with the trimming of outward circumstances.

So, the problem of transformation, that is, of complete inward revolution, is not so difficult. It comes about only in understanding relationship; because relationship is the mirror in which I discover myself in action. And without understanding the total process of myself, there can be no radical revolution. So, in the unfolding of relationship, I begin to discover myself—not only at the superficial level, but at the deeper levels as well. Surely, one can begin there, can one not? One can begin to watch oneself constantly, to observe the sense of possessiveness, the sense of domination, which expresses itself outwardly, in one's office and at home.

And why is there this sense of possession in relationship? Obviously, if we did not possess the person whom we say we love, we would feel frustrated, we would be at a loss, we would be faced with ourselves and our own emptiness, our own loneliness. So, we begin to possess, we begin to dominate, and are thereby caught in jealousy. So, in relationship we begin to discover ourselves; but, in possessing, in dominating another, that relationship does not unfold itself, does not uncover the process of ourselves.

Most of us do not want to know ourselves. But that is the first necessity, is it not?, if we are to understand ourselves. Most of us are afraid to know, afraid to discover, what we are—the ugly and the beautiful—whatever it is. So, we run away from it and use relationship as a means of comfort, as a means of security; and therefore, we never understand our-

selves. The self is a closed door when we seek comfort in relationship. And it is this desire for comfort from which arise all the complications of relationship—domination, jealousy, differentiation, loving one more than another, trying to make love impersonal, trying to be detached, and so on. There can be transformation only in the understanding of oneself. Only then is it possible to have a still mind—a mind that is not made still, but is still, through comprehension.

So, what is important is the intention to discover in relationship what is, what exactly is. And in understanding what is, without condemnation, without justification, one can go beyond it. It is this capacity to look clearly at what is—jealousy, ambition, greed, or whatever is discovered through relationship; it is this capacity to look at it, to be with it, without any sense of condemnation or suppression, without any sense of escape, that makes it possible to go beyond what is. And it is only then that there can be radical transformation.

Therefore, virtue is that state which comes into being, when what is, is transcended. But the transcending, the going beyond what is, cannot take place, if there is effort to be something. After all, that is what we are all trying to do, is it not? We all want to be something—more virtuous, more religious; we want to come nearer to the truth, or we are ambitious, worldly, and so on. We want to be something. We want to have greater understanding, greater happiness, greater wisdom. The very wanting to be something, is the denial of that which is. If I want to be something, I'm not understanding what I am. To understand what I am, this desire to be something, this desire to become, must be understood. Why do we want to be other than what we are? If I do not make an effort to be something, will that lead to contentment, that false, respectable stagnation? Is that the reason why.

we want to be something? Or, is it because we do not face what we are, therefore, it is a process of escape from what is?—this constant desire to be something, with all its turmoil, confusion, struggle, effort, is an escape from what is, an escape from ourselves. And as long as we do not understand ourselves, and merely escape from what is, we only create greater conflict, greater misery. And if we can see that, see the futility of becoming something, of trying to achieve something psychologically, then there comes a contentment with what is. It is only then, that there is no struggle with what is, trying to make it into something else: then it is possible to understand it. But, as long as we are trying to modify, to change what is, then there is no going beyond it. To discover what is, to be content with what is, is not stagnation: on the contrary, to be content with what is, is the most effective action; it does not bring confusion, it does not create enmity. There is so much enmity and confusion in the world, so much misery: and if we desire to bring about a radical transformation there, we must begin with ourselves, begin to understand what is, live with it, look at it without any sense of trying to sublimate, to change, to modify it. And that is not possible when we merely discard what is, by giving it a name; because the very naming of it is a process of condemnation or acceptance. But, when we do not name what is, it is transformed; and with that transformation there comes contentment—not the contentment of acquisition, not the contentment of having or possessing, or achieving a result, but the contentment that comes, when there is no conflict; because it is conflict that creates discontent. And conflict is not creative, it cannot bring understanding. Conflict is unnecessary in life; and conflict comes to an end, only when we can understand what is.

The understanding of what is, comes with freedom from the whole

background of condemnation, justification, or identification. And as we discussed the other day, condemnation arises only when there is the analyzer, the examiner, the observer. But, the observer and the observed are a joint phenomenon; and that unification, that integration between the observer and the observed, takes place only when there is no sense of condemnation, justification or identification—that is, when there is freedom from the background, which is the I, the me, the mine. It is only when there is that freedom from the background that there is a possibility of responding to the challenge anew. Life is a process of challenge and response, and whenever the response is inadequate, there is conflict; and the inadequacy of the response can be removed only through understanding the process of relationship. And as we understand more and more the process of relationship, which is the process of myself in action, there is a possibility of the mind being still. A mind that is not still—whether it is pursuing knowledge, or greed, or becoming something now or in the hereafter—such a mind is incapable, obviously, of discovering; because there must be freedom to discover. And as long as the mind is trying to be something, there can be no discovery. It is only in freedom that there can be discovery, and freedom is virtue; because virtue gives freedom. But, to strive to be virtuous, is not freedom; it is another form of becoming, which is self-expansion.

So, virtue is the denial of becoming; and that denial takes place only with the understanding of what is. And when there is this radical transformation, through self-knowledge, then there is a possibility of creative living. For, truth is not something to be achieved, it is not an end; it is not something to be gained. It comes into being from moment to moment. It is not a result of accumulated, stored-up knowledge, which is merely memory, conditioning, experience.

But truth comes into being from moment to moment, when the mind is capable of being free from all accumulations. For, the accumulator is the self: the self that gathers, in order to assert, to dominate, to expand, to self-fulfil. Only with the freedom of the self does truth come into being—not as a continuous process, but to be discovered from moment to moment. Therefore, to discover, the mind must be fresh, alert, and still.

Question : In what way can I help you in your work ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Is it my work, or your work ? If it is my work, then you will become propagandists. And those who do propaganda are incapable of telling the truth ; because they are merely repetitive machines, not knowing what they are saying. They may know the clever expressions, the slogans, the clichés ; but they can never discover what is true. And most of us are directed by the propagandists ; because we live mostly by words, without much content. We accept words so easily—words like democracy, peace, communist, God, or soul. We never look into these things. We never go beyond the transitory sensations these words evoke. And so, if you are merely a propagandist, or live by propaganda, then you cannot find that which is eternal. And without discovery of truth, life becomes tedious, painful.

So, you are not doing *my* work, you are not helping *me*. But, what you are doing in all this is discovering yourself as you are, understanding yourself ; because, without understanding yourself, there is no basis for action, there is no basis for right thinking. So, you are not helping me in my work, but understanding yourself. And whatever you understand of yourself, that, for the time being, is the truth. And that can be discovered only in daily relationship—and in the relationship between you

and me, as I talk and you listen, and how you listen. If you listen with prejudice, if you listen with your own background, with all your condemnations, prejudices, for or against, then you are not listening : you and I have no relationship. But if you listen to find out about yourself, to discover yourself in relationship, then it's your work, and not my work. Then, since you are seeking truth, you will not be a mere propagandist. Then you are not concerned with convincing another, trying to convert another, to your particular form of belief, trying to reform another, trying to bring another to your particular group, to your particular society. Then you, with your belief, are not important. But, the man with the belief, he is important, because the belief with which he is identified gives him importance. The man who is seeking real self-knowledge is not enclosed by belief ; he is not hedged about by any society, any organisation, by any religion. Therefore, there is no question of your work and my work. What is important, is to discover truth ; and the discovery of truth is not yours or mine.

So, since it is not my work, but your own, it is important how you deal with it, how you approach the whole structure of your life. That is what we are discussing—to see it, to see the structure of your being, and thereby bring about a transformation. The very perception of what is, brings a radical transformation. But if you are listening in order to conform to what I am saying, then you will be a mere propagandist, then you will be a believer : you will create enmity and contention. And, God knows, there are enough groups, beliefs, in the world, all contending with each other, fighting with each other, for money, for membership, and all that nonsense. But the man who is seeking self-knowledge will not create enmity ; because he is honest, he is true to himself, he is true to what is.

But, what is important in this question is, to cease to be a pro-

pagandist, and to experience directly—not through a book, not through another, not through your own particular illusions and deceptions, but—to experience the truth directly for yourself from moment to moment. And such perception of truth is the liberating process. It brings joy to life, it brings clarity, an intensity that does not depend on moods. Therefore, it is your work, and that work begins with self-knowledge.

Question : Is all activity an escape? Is the service of humanity in its greatest need also an escape? Is not individual creative expression a true way of resolving conflict within oneself?

KRISHNAMURTI : What do we mean by activity and escape? Surely, those of us who are at all aware, know that we are extraordinarily dull, extraordinarily empty. We have plenty of knowledge of what others say, of what others have written. We read, we listen, we try to copy, to imitate. But in ourselves we are as nothing. We are empty, insufficient, poor, lonely, driven like a leaf. And to escape from that, that sense of enormous fear, that gnawing anxiety of loneliness, we do all kinds of things, we indulge in all kinds of activities, religious, political, scientific, and so on. And this escape from ourselves is called activity. Is it activity? It is movement, it is agitation, it is something to do; because, if you are left to yourself, you will be aware of that loneliness. So, you turn on the radio, or you pick up a book, or you run after somebody, or cry when that somebody leaves, or dies, because you are left with yourself.

So, without understanding that emptiness, going through with it, understanding it fully, completely, how can you help humanity? What is humanity? Yourself and another, is it not?—you and your wife, you and your neighbour, the immediate world in which you live; not the

Russian world, or the Indian world, but the world you live in. If there is no understanding there, if there is conflict, misery, strife, jealousy, envy there, how can you help humanity at large? It has no meaning, has it? It is merely a phrase of the exploiter, of the lecturer.

So, without understanding yourself, without observing all your activities—the escapes, the process of covering up your own ugliness, your own poverty, your own strife; the pursuit of the Master, the pursuit of virtue—any of these activities must lead to confusion and enmity. So, all activity becomes an escape, without understanding yourself. But, the understanding of yourself does not come through isolation, through cessation of activity. Activity is obviously relationship, action is relationship; and if whatever you discover in that action is shunned, put away, suppressed, avoided, then such activity is bound to create mischief and misery. But if in action, which is relationship, you discover what you are—the pettiness, the shallowness, the snobbishness, the sense of domination, and so on—and be with what you are, then out of that comes action which is entirely different from the activity of escape. Then, that action is releasing, creative. That action is not the outcome of a self-enclosing movement.

And the questioner wants to know if individual creative expression is not a way of resolving the individual conflict. That is, if you have a conflict, go and paint and forget it, release yourself through colour, through action, write a poem, go out for a walk, listen to a concert, pick up a book, go to church, think of the Master, serve humanity—do something. Will that put an end to conflict? Will that resolve the struggle, the pain? You may, as a scientist, be creative in your room, in your laboratory. Or you may paint creatively. But will that resolve your conflict? You may, at that moment of creative expression escape from

or put aside your conflict. But, the moment your work is finished, you are back again where you were, are you not? You may be a scientist, but, the moment you leave your laboratory, you are an ordinary human being, are you not?, with your prejudices, with your nationalism, with your pettiness, your ambition, and all the rest of it. Similarly, you may have moments of creative understanding, creative expression—and then you paint. But the moment you stop painting, you are back with yourself.

Surely, no action will help to put an end to conflict, no activity of any kind will resolve conflict. What resolves conflict, is to be the conflict, completely; and you cannot be directly in relationship with conflict, if you are trying to escape from it. And one of the many ways of escaping is to condemn it, to justify it, to suppress it, to sublimate it, to find a substitute for it. But, if we do not do any of these things, but merely live with it, be passively aware, choicelessly aware of conflict, then the conflict itself will unfold its meaning, it will reveal its content; and only when the content of conflict is revealed, is there freedom from conflict.

Therefore, a mind that is escaping, is incapable of looking at what is, with tranquillity. You may place that escape at any level—whether it be drink, a temple, knowledge, or sensation. As long as activity is merely an escape from what is, it must breed contention and enmity. But, if there is the understanding of what is, then there is liberation, which brings its own action; and that action is entirely different from the activity of escape.

Question : No matter what you say, there are, and there have to be leaders, guides, Masters, teachers. You yourself are one of them. What is your purpose in denying this

obvious fact, and creating a new conflict in us?

KRISHNAMURTI : Whether there are leaders, guides, Masters and teachers, is not important; but what is important is, why you need them. If we begin to discuss whether there are, or there are not Masters, guides and teachers, we shall be lost in opinion and in so-called experience—which is really a self-projected reaction. But it is important, is it not?, to find out why you demand leaders, why you follow teachers, why you worship Masters, why you obey gurus or guides. So, if you can find out why you want them, why you need them, then the problem can be tackled.

You need them, you'll say, because you are confused: you do not know in what direction to go. You need a refuge, a comfort, a crutch, somebody to lean on; you need the glorified father, the glorified mother; you want somebody to tell you what to do, give you a pattern for action, a code; someone to encourage you, to tell you how wonderful you are, or that you are making progress. This all resolves itself into a very simple fact: that you are in conflict and confusion, you are in misery and strife, in hopeless unhappiness, caught in the everyday routine of boring relationship. So, either you create a romantic world of Masters, teachers, a romantic world of super-knowledge; or, because you are confused, you want someone to help you to clear up the confusion.

So, in other words, you are confused, miserable, and you want help from someone to clarify that confusion. And what do you do? When, out of your confusion, you choose a leader, a guru, or a Master, that leader, that guru, that Master, must also be confused. Do you choose when there is clarity? If you are clear, there is no choice; there is no question of demanding, asking, looking for a guide. It is only when you are confused, that you look for a

positively or negatively; then the me is absent, it is not identified with anything—with a nation, with a group, with a particular ideology or religious dogma. When that me is totally absent, then there is simplicity, which expresses i-self in the world of action. But to copy, to imitate, to try to have few things, and be crowded in our minds with ideas, beliefs, desires, passions—such a life is not the simple life.

So, simplicity comes into being, only with the process of understanding the complex me, the structure of myself. The more I understand what is, and the wider and deeper that understanding, the greater the freedom from conflict, from misery. And it is this freedom that brings simplicity. Then the mind is quiet; the

mind is no longer crowded, pursuing. And as the pool is tranquil, so the mind is quiet when the whole process of effort is understood. And with the quietness of the mind, the timeless comes into being. That which is causeless, is simple; and the causeless is the true. It cannot be invented by you; because your inventions, your fabrications of the true, have causation. But that which is true has no causation. God has no cause: it is. And for that state to be, the mind must be extraordinarily simple—not regimented, not disciplined, which is not simplicity, which is merely bondage. When the mind is simple, that which is a blessing comes into being.

October 30, 1949

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS
1949-1950
(*Verbatim Report*)

SERIES I—INDIA

Copyright 1951 by Krishnamurti Writings Inc

Published by
KRISHNAMURTI WRITINGS INC
OJAI, CALIFORNIA
MADRAS, INDIA
LONDON, ENGLAND

Translation and all rights reserved
Printed in India at the G S Press Madras

I

TALK IN RAJAHMUNDRY

There is an art in listening. Listen to find out if what is said is of significance, and after listening, judge, accept, or throw out; but first of all listen. The difficulty with most of us is that we do not listen. We come prepared to be antagonistic or friendly, and not to listen neutrally. If you listen neutrally, surely then only you begin to discover what lies behind the words. Words are a means of communication. You have to learn my vocabulary, the meaning behind my words, and then you will find the significance of the subject. The thing of first importance is to learn to listen rightly. If you read a poem and are biased, how can you understand it? To appreciate what the poet wants you to understand, you must come with freedom to do so.

The problem that confronts most of us at this juncture is whether the individual is merely the instrument of society, or the end of society. Are you and I as individuals to be used, directed, educated, controlled, shaped to a certain pattern by society, government; or does society, the State, exist for the individual? Is the individual the end of society; or is he merely a puppet to be taught, exploited, butchered as an instrument of war? That is the problem that is confronting most of us. That is the problem of the world: whether the individual is a mere instrument of society, a plaything of influences to be moulded; or whether society exists for the individual.

How are you going to find this out? It is a serious problem, isn't it? If the individual is merely an instrument of society, then society is much more important than the individual. If that is true, then we must give up individuality and work for society; then our whole educational system must be entirely revolutionized, and the individual turned into an instru-

ment to be used and destroyed, liquidated, got rid of. But if society exists for the individual, then the function of society is not to make him conform to any pattern, but to give him the feel, the urge of freedom. So we have to find out which is false.

How would you enquire into this problem? It is a vital problem, isn't it? It is not dependent on any ideology, either of the left or of the right; and if it is dependent on an ideology, then it is merely a matter of opinion. Ideas always breed enmity, confusion, conflict. If you depend on books of the left or of the right, or on sacred books, then you depend on mere opinion, whether of Buddha, of Christ, of capitalism, communism, or what you will. They are ideas, not truth. A fact can never be denied. Opinion about fact can be denied. If we can discover what the truth of the matter is, we shall be able to act independently of opinion. Is it not, therefore, necessary to discard what others have said? The opinion of the leftist or other leaders is the outcome of their conditioning. So if you depend for your discovery on what is found in books, you are merely bound by opinion. It is not a matter of knowledge.

How is one to discover the truth of this? On that we will act. To find the truth of this, there must be freedom from all propaganda, which means you are capable of looking at the problem independently of opinion. The whole task of education is to awaken the individual. To see the truth of this, you will have to be very clear, which means you cannot depend on a leader. When you choose a leader you do so out of confusion, and so your leaders are also confused, and that is what is happening in the world. Therefore you cannot look to your leader for guidance or help.

The problem, then, is how to find the truth of this matter: Whether the individual is the instrument of society, or whether society exists for

the individual. How are you going to find this out—not intellectually, but factually? What do you mean by the individual? What is the you? What are we, physically and psychologically, outwardly and inwardly? Are we not the result of environmental influences? Are we not the result of our culture, nationality, religion, and so on? So the individual is the result of education, technical or classical. You are the result of environment. There are those who say that you are not only physical, but something more: in you is reality, God. This, after all, is but an opinion, the result of the influence of society. It is a conditioned response, nothing more. Here in India you believe you are more than the outcome of material influences. Others believe they are nothing more than that. Both beliefs are conditioned. Both are the result of social, economic, and other influences—which is fairly obvious. Therefore we have first to recognize that we are the result of the social influences about us. Whether you believe in Hinduism, Christianity, the leftist ideology, or in nothing at all, you are the result of that conditioning.

Now, to find out if you are something more, there must be freedom from conditioning. To be free you must question the whole social response, and only then can you find out whether the individual is merely the result of society, or something more. That is, you can find out the truth of this only through questioning the social, economic, environmental influence, the ideologies, and so on. Only those who question are capable of creating social revolution. Such individuals, being free of patterns, beliefs, ideologies, are able to help to create a new society which is not based on any conditioning.

So, seeing that the world at the present time is in conflict, with imperialism, wars, starvation, increase in population, unemployment, antagonism—seeing all this, the person

who is really serious has to find out whether the individual is the end of society, that is, whether society exists for the individual. If it does, then the relation between the individual and society is entirely different. Then the individual is a free being in relation to society which is also free. This requires an enormous understanding of oneself. Without self-knowledge there is no basis for thinking: you are merely shaped by the winds of circumstance. Without knowing the total self there can be no right thinking. The understanding of oneself is not to be found in withdrawal from life, in running away from society to the woods; on the contrary, it is to be found in relationship with one's wife, with one's son, with society. Relationship is a mirror in which you see yourself; but you cannot see yourself as you are if you condemn what you see. After all, if you want to understand someone, you do not condemn him, but study, observe him under all conditions. You are a silent watcher observing, not condemning—and then only do you understand. Out of that understanding comes clarity, which is the basis of right thinking. But by the mere repetition of ideas, however wonderful they may be, we become gramophones playing according to various influences, but still gramophones. It is only when we cease to be gramophones that the individual acquires significance. We are then true revolutionaries, because we discover the real. Freedom from ideas, from conditioning, can alone bring revolution—which must begin with you, not with a blue-print. Any clever person can draw up a blue-print, but it is useless. To discover what one is brings about a radical revolution, and that discovery does not depend on a blue-print. Such a discovery is essential to bring about a new State.

I have been handed several questions. Before I answer them, it is important to find out why you ask

questions. Is it to strengthen your opinions, or to create a controversy, or to deny what is said? Because, if you cling to your views, you will listen with your arguments, you will not listen to find out what is being said. I hope you will listen, not in the spirit of antagonism, but to find out what the truth is. If you meet what is being said with your opinions, of what value is it to listen?

Question : In your talks you say that man is the measure of the world, and that when he transforms himself the world will be at peace. Has your own transformation shown this to be true ?

KRISHNAMURTI : What is implied in this question? That though I say I recognize that I am the world, and the world is not separate from me, though I talk against wars and so on, exploitation still goes on; so what I say is futile. Let us examine this. You and the world are not two different entities. You are the world, not as an ideal, but factually. You are the result of climate, of nationality, of various forms of conditioning; and what you think, what you feel, that you project, and you create a world of division. You want to be Telugus against Tamils, God knows why. What you project is the world; you create the world. If you are greedy, that you project; so the world is yourself. As the world is yourself, to transform the world you must know yourself. In the transformation of yourself you produce a transformation in society. The questioner implies that since there is no cessation of exploitation, what I am saying is futile. Is that true? I am going around the world trying to point out truth, not doing propaganda. Propaganda is a lie. You can propagate an idea, but you cannot propagate truth. I go around pointing out truth; and it is for you to recognize it or not. One

man cannot change the world, but you and I can change the world together. This is not a political lecture. You and I have to find out what is truth; for it is truth that dissolves the sorrows, the miseries of the world. The world is not far away in Russia or America or England. The world is where you are, however small it may seem; it is you, your environment, your family, your neighbour, and if that is transformed, you bring transformation in the world. But most of us are lazy, sluggish. What I say is real in itself; but it is futile if you are unwilling to understand it. Transformation can be brought about only by the individual. Great things are performed by individuals, and you can bring about a phenomenal, radical revolution when you understand yourselves. Have you not noticed in history that it is individuals who transform, not the mass? The mass may be influenced, used; but the radical revolutions in life take place with individuals only. Wherever you live, at whatever level of society you may be placed, if you understand yourselves you will bring about transformation in your relationship with others. What is important is to put an end to sorrow; for the ending of sorrow is the beginning of revolution, and that revolution brings about transformation in the world.

Question : You say that gurus are unnecessary, but how can I find truth without the wise help and guidance which only a guru can give?

KRISHNAMURTI : The question is whether a guru is necessary or not. Can truth be found through another? Some say it can, and some say it cannot. As this is a question of importance, I hope you will pay sufficient attention. We want to know the truth of this, not my opinion as against the opinion of another. I have no opinion in this matter. Either it is so, or it is not. Whether it is essential that you should or

should not have a *guru* is not a question of opinion. The truth of the matter is not dependent on opinion, however profound, erudite, popular, universal. The truth of the matter is to be found out, in fact.

First of all, why do we want a *guru*? We say we need a *guru* because we are confused, and the *guru* is helpful: he will point out what truth is, he will help us to understand, he knows much more about life than we do, he will act as a father, as a teacher to instruct us in life; he has vast experience and we have but little; he will help us through his greater experience, and so on and on. That is, basically, you go to a teacher because you are confused. If you were clear, you would not go near a *guru*. Obviously, if you were profoundly happy, if there were no problems, if you understood life completely, you would not go to any *guru*. I hope you see the significance of this. Because you are confused, you seek out a teacher. You go to him to give you a way of life, to clarify your own confusion, to find truth. You choose your *guru* because you are confused, and you hope he will give you what you ask. That is, you choose a *guru* who will satisfy your demand; you choose according to the gratification he will give you, and your choice is dependent on your gratification. You do not choose a *guru* who says, "Depend on yourself"; you choose him according to your prejudices. So, since you choose your *guru* according to the gratification he gives you, you are not seeking truth but a way out of confusion; and the way out of confusion is mistakenly called truth.

Let us examine first this idea that a *guru* can clear up our confusion. Can anyone clear up our confusion? —confusion being the product of our responses. We have created it. Do you think some one else has created it—this misery, this battle at all levels of existence, within and without? It is " " " our own lack

of knowledge of ourselves. It is because we do not understand ourselves, our conflicts, our responses, our miseries, that we go to a *guru* who we think will help us to be free of that confusion. We can understand ourselves only in relationship to the present; and that relationship itself is the *guru*, not someone outside. If I do not understand that relationship, whatever a *guru* may say is useless; because, if I do not understand relationship, my relationship to property, to people, to ideas, who can resolve the conflict within me? To resolve that conflict, I must understand it myself, which means I must be aware of myself in relationship. To be aware, no *guru* is necessary. If I do not know myself, of what use is a *guru*? As a political leader is chosen by those who are in confusion, and whose choice therefore is also confused, so I choose a *guru*. I can choose him only according to my confusion; hence he, like the political leader, is confused.

So, what is important is not who is right—whether I am right, or whether those are right who say a *guru* is necessary; but to find out why you need a *guru* is important. *Gurus* exist for exploitation of various kinds, but that is irrelevant. It gives you satisfaction if someone tells you how you are progressing. But to find out why you need a *guru*—there lies the key. Another can point out the way; but you have to do all the work, even if you have a *guru*. Because you do not want to face that, you shift the responsibility to the *guru*. The *guru* becomes useless when there is a particle of self-knowledge. No *guru*, no book or scripture, can give you self-knowledge: it comes when you are aware of yourself in relationship. To be, is to be related; not to understand relationship is misery, strife. Not to be aware of your relationship to property is one of the causes of confusion. If you do not know your

right relationship to property, there is bound to be conflict, which increases the conflict in society. If you do not understand the relationship between you and your wife, between you and your child, how can another resolve the conflict arising out of that relationship? Similarly with ideas, beliefs, and so on. Being confused in your relationship with people, with property, with ideas, you seek a *guru*. If he is a real *guru*, he will tell you to understand yourself. You are the source of all misunderstanding and confusion; and you can resolve that conflict only when you understand yourself in relationship.

You cannot find truth through anybody else. How can you? Surely, truth is not something static; it has no fixed abode; it is not an end, a goal. On the contrary, it is living, dynamic, alert, alive. How can it be an end? If truth is a fixed point, it is no longer truth: it is then a mere opinion. Sir, truth is the unknown, and a mind that is seeking truth will never find it. For mind is made up of the known, it is the result of the past, the outcome of time—which you can observe for yourself. Mind is the instrument of the known, hence it cannot find the unknown; it can only move from the known to the known. When the mind seeks truth, the truth it has read about in books, that 'truth' is self-projected; for then the mind is merely in pursuit of the known, a more satisfactory known than the previous one. When the mind seeks truth, it is seeking its own self-projection, not truth. After all, an ideal is self-projected; it is fictitious, unreal. What is real is what is, not the opposite. But a mind that is seeking reality, seeking God, is seeking the known. When you think of God, your God is the projection of your own thought, the result of social influences. You can think only of the known; you cannot think of the unknown, you cannot concentrate on truth. The moment you think of

the unknown, it is merely the self-projected known. So, God or truth cannot be thought about. If you think about it, it is not truth. Truth cannot be sought: it comes to you. You can go only after what is known. When the mind is not tortured by the known, by the effects of the known, then only can truth reveal itself. Truth is in every leaf, in every tear; it is to be known from moment to moment. No one can lead you to truth; and if anyone leads you, it can only be to the known.

Truth can only come to the mind that is empty of the known. It comes in a state in which the known is absent, not functioning. The mind is the warehouse of the known, the residue of the known; and for the mind to be in that state in which the unknown comes into being, it must be aware of itself, of its previous experiences, the conscious as well as the unconscious, of its responses, reactions, and structure. When there is complete self-knowledge, then there is the ending of the known, then mind is completely empty of the known. It is only then that truth can come to you uninvited. Truth does not belong to you or to me. You cannot worship it. The moment it is known, it is unreal. The symbol is not real, the image is not real; but when there is the understanding of self, the cessation of self, then eternity comes into being.

Question: In order to have peace of mind, must I not learn to control my thoughts?

KRISHNAMURTI: To understand this question properly, we must go into it deeply, and that requires close attention. I hope you are not too tired to follow it.

My mind wanders. Why?—I want to think about a picture, an idea, an image, about it I see that my

off to the railway or to something that happened yesterday. The first thought has gone, and another has taken its place. Therefore I examine every thought that arises. That is intelligent, isn't it? But you make an effort to fix your thought on something. Why should you fix it? If you are interested in the thought that comes, then it gives you its significance. The wandering is not distraction—do not give it a name. Follow the wandering, the distraction, find out why the mind has wandered; pursue it, go into it fully. When the distraction is completely understood, then that particular distraction is gone. When another comes, pursue it also. Mind is made up of innumerable demands and longings; and when it understands them, it is capable of an awareness which is not exclusive. Concentration is exclusiveness, it is resistance against something. Such concentration is like putting on blinkers—it is obviously useless, it does not lead to reality. When a child is interested in a toy, there is no distraction.

Comment from the audience: But that is momentary.

KRISHNAMURTI: What do you mean? Do you want a sustained wall to hold you in? Are you a human being or a machine, to be limited, circumscribed? All concentration is exclusive. In that concentrated exclusion, nothing can penetrate your desire to be something. So concentration, which so many practise, is the denial of real meditation. Meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge, and without self-knowledge you cannot meditate. Without self-knowledge your meditation is valueless, it is merely a romantic escape. So, concentration, which is a process of exclusion, of resistance, cannot open the door to that state of mind in which there is

no resistance. If you resist your child, you do not understand him. You must be open to all his vagaries, every one of his moods. Likewise, to understand yourself, you must be alive to every movement of the mind, every thought that arises. Every thought that comes implies some interest—do not call it distraction and condemn it: pursue it completely, fully. You want to concentrate on what is being said, and your mind wanders off to what a friend said last evening. This conflict you call distraction. So you say, "Help me to learn concentration, to fix my mind on one thing". But if you understand what causes distraction, then there is no necessity to try to concentrate: whatever you do is concentration. So the problem is not the wandering away, but why the mind wanders. When the mind is wandering away from what is being said, then you are not interested in what is being said. If you are interested, you are not distracted. You think you ought to be interested in a picture, an idea, a lecture, but your interest is not in it; so the mind goes off all over the place. Why should you not acknowledge that you are not interested, and let the mind wander? When you are not interested, it is a waste of effort to fix the mind, which merely creates a conflict between what you think you should be, and the actual. It is like a motor car moving with the brakes applied. Such concentration is futile. It is exclusion, a pushing away. Why not acknowledge the distraction first? That is a fact. When the mind becomes quiet, when all the problems are resolved, it is like a pool with still waters in which you can see clearly. It is not quiet when it is caught up in the net of problems, for then you resort to suppression. When the mind follows and understands every thought there is no distraction, and then it is quiet. Only in freedom can the mind be silent. When the mind is silent, not only the upper

part, but fully; when it is free from all values, from the pursuit of its own projections, then there is no distraction; and only then reality comes into being.

November 20, 1949

II

TALK IN RAJAHMUNDY

It is very obvious that all problems require, not an answer, a conclusion, but the understanding of the problem itself. For the answer, the solution to the problem, is in the problem; and to understand the problem, whatever it is—personal or social, intimate or general—a certain quietness, a certain quality of unidentification with the problem is essential. That is, we see in the world at the present time great conflicts going on: ideological conflicts, the confusion and struggle of conflicting ideas, ultimately leading to war; and through it all, we want peace. Because, obviously, without peace one cannot create individually, which requires a certain quietness, a sense of undisturbed existence. To live quietly, peacefully, is essential in order to create, to think anew about any problem.

Now, what is the major factor that brings about this lack of peace within and without? That is our problem. We have innumerable problems of various types; and to resolve them, there must be a field of quietness, a sense of patient observation, a silent approach; and that is essential to the resolution of any problem. What is the thing which prevents that peace, that silent observation of what is? It seems to me that, before we begin to talk of peace, we ought to understand the state of contradiction; because, that is the disturbing factor which hinders peace. We see contradiction in us and about us; and, as I have tried to explain, what we are, the world is. Whatever our

ambitions, our pursuits, our aims, it is upon them that we base the structure of society. So, because we are in contradiction, there is lack of peace in us, and therefore outside of us. There is in us a constant state of denial and assertion—what we want to be, and what we are. The state of contradiction creates conflict, and this conflict does not bring about peace—which is a simple, obvious fact. This inward contradiction should not be translated into some kind of philosophical dualism, because that is a very easy escape. That is, by saying that contradiction is a state of dualism, we think we have solved it—which is obviously a mere convention, a contributory escape from actuality.

Now, what do we mean by conflict, by contradiction? Why is there a contradiction in us. You understand what I mean by contradiction—this constant struggle to be something apart from what I am. I am this, and I want to be that. This contradiction in us is a fact, not a metaphysical dualism, which we need not discuss. Metaphysics has no significance in understanding what is. We may discuss, say, dualism, what it is, if it exists, and so on; but of what value is it if we don't know that there is contradiction in us, opposing desires, opposing interests, opposing pursuits? That is, I want to be good, and I am not able to be. This contradiction, this opposition in us must be understood, because it creates conflict; and in conflict, in struggle, we cannot create individually. Let us be clear on the state we are in. There is contradiction, so there must be struggle; and struggle is destruction, waste. In that state we can produce nothing but antagonism, strife, more bitterness and sorrow. If we can understand this fully and hence be free of contradiction, then there can be inward peace, which will bring understanding of each other.

So, the problem is this. Seeing that conflict is destructive, wasteful,

why is it that in each of us there is contradiction? To understand that, we must go a little further. Why is there the sense of opposing desires? I do not know if we are aware of it in ourselves—this contradiction, this sense of wanting and not wanting, remembering something and trying to forget it and face something new. Just watch it. It is very simple and very normal. It is not something extraordinary. The actual fact is, there is contradiction. Then why does this contradiction arise? Is it not important to understand this? Because, if there were no contradiction, there would be no conflict, there would be no struggle; then what is could be understood without bringing into it an opposing element which creates conflict. So, our question is, is it not, why is there this contradiction, and hence this struggle which is waste and destruction? What do we mean by contradiction? Does it not imply an impermanent state which is being opposed by another impermanent state? That is, I think I have a permanent desire. I posit in myself a permanent desire, and another desire arises which contradicts it; and this contradiction brings about conflict, which is waste. That is, there is a constant denial of one desire by another desire, one pursuit overcoming another pursuit. Now, is there such a thing as a permanent desire? Surely, all desire is impermanent—not metaphysically, but actually. Don't translate this into something metaphysical and think you have understood it. Actually, all desire is impermanent. I want a job. That is, I look to a certain job as a means of happiness; and when I get it, I am dissatisfied. I want to become the manager, then the owner, and so on and on, not only in this world, but in the so-called spiritual world—the teacher becoming the principal, the priest becoming the bishop, the pupil becoming the Master.

So, this constant becoming, arriving

at one state after another, brings about contradiction, does it not? Therefore, why not look at life, not as one permanent desire, but as a series of fleeting desires always in opposition to each other? Hence the mind need not be in a state of contradiction. If I regard life, not as a permanent desire, but as a series of temporary desires that are constantly changing, then there is no contradiction. I do not know if I am explaining myself clearly; because it is important to realize that wherever there is contradiction there is conflict, and conflict is unproductive, wasteful, whether it is a quarrel between two people, or a struggle within; like war, it is utterly destructive.

So, contradiction arises only when the mind has a fixed point of desire; that is, when the mind does not regard all desire as moving, transient, but seizes upon one desire and makes that into a permanency—only then, when other desires arise, is there contradiction. But all desires are in constant movement, there is no fixation of desire. There is no fixed point in desire; but the mind establishes a fixed point because it treats everything as a means to arrive, to gain; and there must be contradiction, conflict, as long as one is arriving. I do not know if you see that point.

It is important to see, first of all, that conflict is essentially destructive, whether it is the communal conflict, the conflict between nations, between ideas, or the conflict within the individual. It is unproductive; and that struggle is utilized, exploited by the priests, by the politicians. If we realize this, actually see that struggle is destructive, then we have to find out how to bring about the cessation of struggle, and must therefore enquire into contradiction; and contradiction always implies the desire to become, to gain, the desire to arrive—which after all is what we mean by the so-called search for truth. That is, you want to arrive, you want to succeed,

you want to find an ultimate God or truth which will be your permanent satisfaction. Therefore, you are not seeking truth, you are not seeking God. You are seeking lasting gratification, and that gratification you clothe with an idea, a respectable-sounding word such as God, truth; but actually you are each one seeking gratification, and you place that gratification, that satisfaction, at the highest point, calling it God, and the lowest point is drink. As long as the mind is seeking gratification, there is not much difference between God and drink. Socially, drink may be bad; but the inward desire for gratification, for gain, is even more harmful, is it not? If you really want to find truth, you must be extremely honest, not merely at the verbal level, but altogether; you must be extraordinarily clear, and you cannot be clear if you are unwilling to face facts. That is what we are attempting to do at these meetings—to see clearly for ourselves what is. If you do not want to see, you can walk away; but if you want to find truth, you must be extraordinarily and scrupulously clear. Therefore, a man who wants to understand reality must obviously understand this whole process of gratification—gratification not only in the literal sense, but in the more psychological sense. As long as the mind is fixed as a 'permanent' center, identified with an idea, with a belief, there must be contradiction in life; and that contradiction breeds antagonism, confusion, struggle, which means there can be no peace. So, merely to force the mind to be peaceful is utterly useless; because a mind that is disciplined, forced, compelled to be peaceful, is not at peace. That which is made peaceful is not peaceful. You can impose your will, your authority on a child to make him peaceful; but that child is not peaceful. To be peaceful is quite a different thing.

So, to understand this whole process of existence in which there is constant struggle, pain, constant disagreement, constant frustration, we must understand the process of the mind; and this understanding of the process of the mind is self-knowledge. After all, if I do not know how to think, what basis have I to think rightly? I must know myself. In knowing myself, there comes quietness, there comes freedom; and in that freedom there is discovery of what is truth—not truth at an abstract level, but in every incident of life, in my words, in my gestures, in the way I talk to my servant. Truth is to be found in the fears, in the sorrows, in the frustrations of daily living, because that is the world we live in, the world of turmoil, the world of misery. If we do not understand that, merely to understand some abstract reality is an escape, which leads to further misery. So, what is important is to understand oneself; and understanding oneself is not apart from the world, because the world is where you are, it is not miles away; the world is the community in which you live, your environmental influences, the society which you have created—all that is the world; and in that world, unless you understand yourself, there can be no radical transformation, no revolution, and hence no individual creativeness. Don't be frightened of that word 'revolution'. It is really a marvellous word with tremendous significance if you know what it means. But most of us do not want change, most of us resist change; we would like a modified continuity of what is, which is called revolution—but that is not revolution. Revolution can come into being—and it is essential for such a revolution to take place—only when you as an individual understand yourself in relation to society, and therefore transform yourself; and such a revolution is not momentary, but constant.

So, life is a series of contradictions, and without understanding those contradictions, there can be no peace. It is essential to have peace, to have physical security, in order to live, to create. But everything we do contradicts. We want peace, and all our actions produce war. We want no communal strife, and yet that hope is denied. So, until we understand this process of contradiction in ourselves, there can be no peace, and therefore no new culture, no new State; and to understand that contradiction, we must face ourselves, not theoretically, but as we are, not with previous conclusions, with quotations from the *Bhagavadgita*, from Sankara, and so on. We must take ourselves as we really are, the pleasant as well as the unpleasant, which requires the capability of looking at exactly what is; and we cannot understand what is, if we condemn, if we identify, if we justify. We must look at ourselves as we would look at that man walking on the road, and that requires constant awareness—awareness, not at some extraordinary level, but awareness of what we are, of our speech, our responses, our relationship to property, to poor people, to the beggar, to the scholar, and so on. Awareness must begin at that level, because to go far, one must begin near; but most of us are unwilling to begin near. It is much easier—at least we think it—is much easier—to begin far away, which is an escape from the near. We all have ideals. We are experts at escape, and that is the curse of these escapist religions. To go far, one must begin near. This does not require some extraordinary renunciation, but a state of high sensitivity; because that which is highly sensitive is receptive, and only in that state of sensitivity can there be a reception of truth—which is not for the dull, the sluggard, the unaware. He can never find truth. But the man who begins near, who is aware of his gesture, of his talk, the manner

of his eating, the manner of his speech, the ways of his behaviour—for him there is a possibility of going very extensively, very widely into the causes of conflict. You cannot climb high if you do not begin low; but you do not want to begin low, you do not want to be simple, you do not want to be humble. Humility is humour, and without humour you cannot go far. But humour is not a thing which you can cultivate. So, a man who would really seek, who would know what truth is, or who would be open to truth, must begin very near, he must sensitize himself through awareness so that his mind is polished, clear, and simple. Such a mind is not pursuing its own desires, it does not worship a home-made ideal. Only then can there be peace; for such a mind discovers that which is immeasurable.

Question : Why don't you feed the poor instead of talking ?

KRISHNAMURTI: It is essential to be critically aware, but not to pass judgment; because the moment you pass judgment, you have already concluded. You are not critically aware. The moment you come to a conclusion, your critical capacity is dead. Now, the questioner implies that he is feeding the poor, and I am not. I wonder if the questioner is feeding the poor! So, put yourself this question, "Are you feeding the poor?". I am trying to enquire into the mentality of the questioner. Either he is criticising to find out, and therefore is at perfect liberty to criticize, to enquire; or he is criticizing with a conclusion, and therefore is no longer critical, is merely imposing his conclusion; or, if the questioner is feeding the poor, then his question is justified. But, are you feeding the poor? Are you at all aware of the poor? On the average, people in India die at 27; in America and New Zealand it is 64

to 67. If you were aware of the poor, this state of things would not go on in India.

Now, the questioner wants to know why I am talking. I will tell you. To feed the poor, you must have complete revolution—not a superficial revolution of the left or of the right, but a radical revolution; and you can have radical revolution only when ideas have ceased. A revolution based on an idea is not a revolution; because an idea is merely the reaction to a particular conditioning, and action based on a conditioning is not productive of fundamental change. So, I am talking to produce, not mere superficial change, but fundamental change. This is not a matter of inventing new ideas. It is only when you and I are free of ideas, whether of the left or of the right, that we can produce a radical revolution, inwardly and so outwardly. Then there is no question of rich and poor. Then there is human dignity, the right to work, opportunity and happiness for each one. Then there is no man with too much who must feed those with too little. There is no class difference. This is not a mere idea; it is not a utopia. It is an actuality when this radical revolution is inwardly taking place, when in each one of us there is fundamental change. Then there will be no class, no nationalities, no wars, no destructive separatism; and that can come about only when there is love in your heart. Real revolution can come only when there is love, not otherwise. Love is the only flame without smoke; but unfortunately we have filled our hearts with the things of the mind, and therefore our hearts are empty and our minds are full. When you fill the heart with thoughts, then love is merely an idea. Love is not idea; but if you think about love, it is not love: it is merely a projection of thought. To cleanse the mind, there must be fullness of heart; but the heart must be emptied of the mind

before it can be full, and that is a tremendous revolution. All other revolutions are merely the continuation of a modified state.

Sir, when you love somebody—not the way we love people, which is only thinking about them—, when you love people completely, wholely, then there is neither rich nor poor. Then you are not conscious of yourselves. Then there is that flame in which there is no smoke of jealousy, envy, greed, sensation. It is only such a revolution that can feed the world—and it is up to you, not to me. But most of us have grown accustomed to listen to talks because we live in words. Words have become important because we are newspaper readers; we listen habitually to political talks which are full of words without much meaning. So we are fed on words, we survive on words; and most of you are listening to these talks merely on the verbal level, and therefore there is no real revolution in you. But it is up to you to bring about that revolution, not the revolution of blood, which is a modified continuity which we miscall revolution, but that revolution which comes into being when the mind is no longer filling the heart, when thought is no longer taking the place of affection, compassion. But you cannot have love when the mind is predominant. Most of you are not cultured, but merely well-read; and you live by what you have learned. Such knowledge does not bring about revolution, does not bring about transformation. What brings about transformation is understanding everyday conflicts, everyday relationships. When the heart is empty of the things of the mind, then only that flame of reality comes. But one must be capable of receiving it; and to receive it, one cannot have a conclusion based on knowledge and determination. Such a mind, being peaceful, not bound by ideas, is capable of receiving that which is infinite, and therefore it creates revolution—not merely to feed the poor or to give

them employment, or to give power to those who have no power; but it will be a different world of different value, not based on monetary satisfaction.

So, words don't feed hungry men. Words to me are not important; I am using words merely as a means of communication. We can use any word as long as we understand each other; and I am not giving you ideas, I am not feeding you words. I am talking so that you can see clearly for yourselves that which you are, and from that perception you can act clearly and definitely and purposefully. Only then is there a possibility of co-operative action. Talking merely to amuse ourselves is of no value; but talking to understand ourselves, and thus bring about transformation, is essential.

Question : In your Talks in 1944, the following question was put to you : "You are in a happy position. All your needs are met. We have to earn money for ourselves, our wives and families. We have to attend the world. How can you understand us and help us ?" That is the question.

KRISHNAMURTI : I tried to answer the question, I did not evade it; but perhaps I may have put it in a way that appears to the questioner as evasion. Life is not a thing to be settled with 'yes' or 'no'; life is complicated, it has no such permanent conclusion. It is like your wanting to know if there is or is not reincarnation. We must go into it. In discussing it, you think I am evading, because your mind is fixed on one thing, either 'there is' or 'there is not'. So, from your point of view, it is obviously an evasion; but if you look into it a little more clearly, you will see that it is not evasion.

Now, the questioner wants to know, since my needs are provided by others, how can I understand those who are struggling with life to pro-

vide for their families and themselves? What is the implication of this question? That you are privileged and we are not; and how can the privileged class understand the unprivileged? So the question is: Can the privileged person understand the unprivileged?

First of all, am I privileged? I am privileged only when I accept position, authority, power, the prestige of asserting myself to be somebody—which I have never done; because to be somebody is highly immoral, unethical and unspiritual. To be somebody denies reality; and it is only the one who is somebody that is privileged. He exploits and denies, but I am not in that position. I go about speaking, and for that I am paid as you are paid for your job; and I am treated exactly on that level. My needs are not very great, because I do not believe in great needs. A man who is burdened with many possessions is thoughtless; but the man who avoids possessions, and the man who is identified with a few possessions, are equally thoughtless. So, I earn my living as you earn yours. I speak, and I am asked to go to different parts of the world. Those who ask me to go, pay for it. If they do not ask, if I do not talk, it is alright. For me, talking is not a means of self-expression or exploitation. I do not find gratification in it; it is not a means of exploiting you or getting your money, because I do not want you to do any charity, to believe this or not to believe that. I am talking merely to help you see that which you are, to be clear in yourself. For in clarity there is happiness; in understanding there is enlightenment. There is happiness in discussing together, for in that discussion we can see ourselves as we are. This relationship may act as a mirror, for all relationship is a mirror in which you and I discover ourselves.

But the questioner wants to know how I can understand and help those

who are earning money in order to maintain their families. In other words, the questioner says: "You don't have a family. You don't go through the daily routine of the school, to be insulted by the boys. You are not in a position to be heckled by the wife. So, how can you understand me, who have to encounter all this horror every day ?"

Perhaps I understand because it is very simple, and it may be that you do not understand. It may be that you are not facing the thing as it is. When you go through the turmoil, the responsibilities, how do you go through them? Why do you go through the routine of going to the office? You call that a responsibility, a duty. Why do you put up with ugly things in life? Why do you put up with your wife and children, or why do you love them—if you do love them? Sir, think it out for yourself. Don't answer me. Don't laugh at it. That is one of the easiest ways of brushing it aside—to make a joke of it. Apparently your wife and children are merely a duty, a responsibility, and so you find life a hollow bore. And I say to you, why do you put up with all that? You say: "I can't help it. To run away from it is impossible. I would like to be free of it, but society would condemn my action. What would happen to my children, to my wife, to my husband?" So, you say it is your *karma*, it is your duty, it is your responsibility, and you postpone the problem. You do not want to look at the thing as it is. It is only when you think it out without fear, when you directly face it, that you will see that you have a different relationship with your wife, with your child. Sir, it is because you don't love your wife and children that you have this horror of family life. You have made sex into an enormous problem because you have no other relationship mentally, emotionally, morally. You are bound by your religion, by society, and the

only other release possible to you is to have success; and as you are caught, bound and held, you rebel against it; you want to be free, and yet you are not. That is the contradiction, and therefore you struggle, which is such a wasteful thing. And, after all, why have we to live in the routine of an office to earn money, to have a job? Sir, have you ever tried not doing anything, really giving up, not calculating? Then you will see that life will feed you. But renunciation with a calculation is not renunciation. Renunciation with an end in view, giving up in order to find God, is merely the search for power. It is not renunciation. To renounce, you cannot look to tomorrow. But you see, we dare not think in these terms. We are respectable people. We have cultivated minds. We play a double game. We are not honest with ourselves and therefore with our families, with our children, with society. Being inwardly uncertain, insecure, we cling to outward things, to the position, to the wife, to the husband, to the children, and they become a means of gratification. I want somebody to be with me, to encourage me, generally the wife or the husband; so we use another for our own gratification. Surely, all this is not very difficult to understand. It is difficult only when you merely examine the superficial side of it. Most of us do not want to go deeply into these questions, so we try to evade them. Sir, a person who evades, who avoids looking at what is, will never find reality. The religious person is one who sees directly what is, he does not seek reality away from that. Reality is in your relationship with your wife and children, in the way you earn money: it is not somewhere else. You cannot earn money through wrong means; you must have a right means of livelihood. Truth is not away from that, but is to be discovered in everyday action; and because we avoid all these things, our

life is a misery. Our life is empty, has no meaning, except to breed children, earn a living, master a few words of Sanskrit, and do some puja. This we call existence. This we call living, an empty thing without much significance. Surely, to point out all this is not evading the question. To understand it, obviously you and I must go into it. I am not your *guru*; because, if you choose me as your *guru*, you will make me into another escape, and what you choose out of your confusion must also be confused. So, truth is a thing to be discovered from moment to moment, in every movement of life; and to understand that, you and I can talk it over, think it out together. I am not imposing something on you which you will never look into. We are talking it over to see our problem clearly, with the dignity of human beings, not with the desire to worship each other.

So, what is important in this question is whether I can really help you to understand yourself. I can help you only if you want to understand yourself; if you don't, the problem is simple: I cannot help you. That is neither wrong nor right. It simply cannot be done. But, if we both want to understand and therefore you and I have a relationship in which there is no fear, no subservience, then you can discover yourself as you are. That is all relationship can do—to offer a mirror in which to discover oneself; and the more you understand, the more there is quietness, tranquillity in the mind; and in that peace, in that silence, reality comes into being.

Question : What is the purpose of prayer ?

KRISHNAMURTI : To answer this question, we must go into it fully, because it is a complex problem. Let us see what we mean by prayer, then we will find out its purpose. What do you mean by prayer?

When do you pray? Not when you are happy, not when you are delighted, not when there is joy or pleasure in you. You pray only when you are in confusion, when you are in trouble, and then your prayer is a petition. A man in trouble prays, which means he is begging, he wants help. He is petitioning, he is asking to be comforted. (Laughter.) There is nothing to laugh at. So, the man who is content, the man who is happy, the man who sees very clearly and understands reality in the action of everyday—such a man is not in need of prayer. You don't pray when you are joyous; you don't pray when there is delight in your heart. You pray only when there is confusion, or your prayer is merely a begging petition, a demand for help, for comfort, for alleviation. Is it not? In other words, you are in confusion, and you want some outside agency to get you out of that confusion. You want somebody to help you; and the more there is of the psychological element in your problem, the more urgent the demand for outside help. So, either you pray to God, or, if you are a modern person, you go to a psychologist; or, in order to escape from that confusion, you repeat a lot of words. You attend various prayer meetings where you are shepherded together and mesmerized into a certain state and you think you have the answer. These are all actual facts. I am not inventing, I am just showing the implications of what you mean by prayer. As we go to a doctor when in physical pain, so when we are in psychological confusion we escape into mass hypnotism, or petition some outside agency for help. That is what we do, is it not? I am thinking aloud for you, that is all: I am not imposing anything on you. So, our prayer is addressed, not to truth, but to an outside agency, which we call a guide, a *guru*, or God. That is, when in pain, when in psychological con-

flict, we turn to somebody. It is the natural instinct of a boy turning to his father for help. When I do not understand my relationships with people, when I am in confusion, I call somebody to help me—which is a natural instinct, is it not ?

Now, can an outside agency help me ? Not that there is no outside agency—we will go into that another time ; but, can an outside agency help me when I have a problem, when I am in conflict, in confusion which I have created myself ? I have created conflict in my relationship with society. I have done something which brings about conflict. Surely, I am responsible for that confusion, not another ; and until I understand it, what is the value of my turning to an outside agency ? The outside agency may help me to get out of it, may help me to escape from it ; but as long as I do not understand my turmoil, I will create another. That is what we are doing : We create a confusion, find some way to get out of it, and plunge into another confusion. So, until I understand the maker of confusion, which is myself, until I clear that confusion for myself, merely turning to an outside agency is of very little value. I know you won't like this, you will resist it, because you do not want to look at things as they are ; but surely I have to look at myself clearly in order to understand the cause of confusion. So, that is one fact.

Then we know the simple way of escaping from what is by denying it. We either cover it up through a repetition of words, or escape from it by going to a mass prayer meeting. We know these various ways. You go to a temple and repeat a lot of words ; you keep on repeating, and you think you are transformed. You have an answer, you have found a conclusion. It is merely a way of evading the problem. You have not looked at the problem. What happens when you pray ? What do you do when you pray ? You repeat cer-

tain words, certain phrases. What does it do to the mind when you constantly repeat certain prayers ? By the repetition of phrases, the mind is made quiet. It is not quiet, but it is *made* quiet. There is a difference between a quiet mind, and a mind that is *made* quiet. The mind that is *made* quiet by repetition is compelled, hypnotized into silence. Now, what happens when the mind is hypnotized into silence ? What happens when the mind is made artificially quiet ? Have you thought it out ? Think it out, and see where it leads. You have to pay a little attention, experiment with yourself, and not be distracted by those who come in and go out. Those of you who are interested, sit near.

Now, what happens to a mind that is *made* quiet ? That is, you have a problem, and you want to find an answer. Therefore you pray, which is a repetition of certain phrases, and through that the mind is made quiet. What is the relationship between that hypnotized mind and the problem ? Please follow this a little. You desire to find an answer to the problem, and therefore use, chant certain words to make the mind quiet ; that is, you want a satisfactory answer to the problem, an answer that will be gratifying, not an answer that may contradict you. So, when you pray and make the mind quiet through words, you are looking for an answer which will be satisfying. You have already conceived the answer, which must be satisfactory ; therefore, you will find a satisfactory answer. Please see the importance of this, Sir. You create what you want through dulling and making the mind quiet ; by forcing the mind to pray, you have already established what you want : an answer which will be satisfactory, peaceful, completely satisfying. Therefore, the mind which is seeking an answer to the problem through prayer will find the answer which is satisfactory. Therefore it is settled, and you say

the answer is from God. That is why political leaders shout that they represent God, or that God has spoken to them directly: because they have identified themselves with the country, they get a satisfactory answer.

So, what happens to a mind that is unwilling to understand the problem and thus seeks the answer from an outside agency? Consciously or unconsciously, it gets a satisfactory answer—otherwise it would reject the answer. That is, those who pray are seeking satisfaction, and are therefore incapable of understanding the problem itself. When the mind is made quiet through prayer, the unconscious, which is the residue of your own satisfactory conclusions, projects itself into the conscious mind, and therefore your prayer is answered. So, when you pray, you are seeking an escape, happiness; and the outside agency which answers you is your own gratification, your own conscious or unconscious identification with the particular desire which you want to gratify.

So, I have a problem. I do not want to escape from it, I do not want an answer, I do not want a conclusion. I want to understand; because the moment I understand something, I am free of it. So, need I go through the process of hypnotizing myself, in order to understand, or of being hypnotized by words, forcing the mind to be quiet? Surely not. When I have a problem, I want to understand it. Understanding can come only when the mind is no longer judging the problem, that is, when the mind can look at it without condemnation or justification. Then the mind is quiet, not made quiet; and when the mind is quiet, then you will see that the problem unfolds itself. If you do not condemn, if you do not try to find an answer, the mind is quiet; in that quietness the problem reveals its own answer, not one satisfying to you. Therefore the truth of the problem comes from the problem itself; but you cannot see

the truth of the problem if you approach it with a conclusion, a prayer, a petition, which intervenes between yourself and the problem.

So, the man who wants to understand any problem can understand it only when the mind is quiet, not taking sides. When you want to understand the problem of unemployment, of human misery, you cannot take sides. But your politicians want you to take sides. If you are to understand the problem, there can be no sides, because the problem is not a matter of opinion, it does not demand an ideology. It demands that you should look at it clearly so as to understand its content; and you cannot understand the content of a problem if you have a screen of ideology between you and the problem. Similarly, prayer without self-knowledge leads to ignorance, to illusion. Self-knowledge is meditation, and without self-knowledge there is no meditation. Meditation is not fixing the mind on some object: meditation is understanding what is in relationship. Then the mind need not be forced to be quiet. Then the mind is extremely sensitive, and therefore highly receptive. But to discipline the mind to be quiet destroys receptivity.

Perhaps we shall discuss this again next Sunday. To understand a problem, you must understand the creator of the problem, which is yourself. The problem is not apart from you. So, to understand yourself is of the highest importance; and to understand yourself you cannot withdraw from relationship, because relationship is a mirror in which you see yourself. Relationship is action, not abstract action but every-day action: your quarrels, your anger, your grief; and as you understand all that in relation to yourself, there comes quietness of mind, a tranquillity. In that tranquillity there is freedom. Only with that freedom is there the perception of truth.

November 27, 1949

III

TALK IN RAJAHMUNDRI

There will be a discussion tomorrow morning at 7-45, and also on Tuesday at the same time; but there will be no talk next Sunday. This is the last talk.

I have said that there is an art in listening, and perhaps I can go a little more into it, because I think it is important to listen rightly. We generally hear what we want to hear, and exclude everything that is disturbing. To any expression of a disturbing idea we turn a deaf ear; and specially in matters that are profound, religious, that have significance in life, we are apt to listen very superficially. If we hear at all, it is merely the words, not the content of the words; because most of us do not want to be disturbed. Most of us want to carry on in our old ways; because to alter, to bring about a change, means disturbance: disturbance in our daily life, disturbance in our family, disturbance between wife and husband, between ourselves and society. As most of us are disinclined to be disturbed, we prefer to follow the easy way of existence; and whether it leads to misery, to turmoil and conflict, is apparently of very little importance. All that we want is an easy life—not too much trouble, not too much disturbance, not too much thinking; and so, when we listen, we are not really hearing anything. Most of us are afraid to hear deeply; but it is only when we hear deeply when the sounds penetrate deeply, that there is a possibility of a fundamental, radical change. Such change is not possible if you listen superficially; and if I may suggest, at least for this evening, please try to listen without any resistance, without any prejudice—just listen. Do not make tremendous effort to understand, because understanding does not come through effort, understanding does not come through striving. Understanding comes swift-

ly, unknowingly, when the effort is passive; only when the maker of effort is silent does the wave of understanding come. So, if I may suggest, listen as you would listen to the water that is flowing by. You are not imagining, you are not making an effort to listen, you are just listening. Then the sound conveys its own meaning, and that understanding is far deeper, far greater and more lasting, than the mere understanding of words that comes through intellectual effort. The understanding of words which is called intellectual comprehension is utterly empty. You say, "I understand intellectually, but I cannot put it into practice"; which means, really, that you do not understand. When you understand, you understand the content; there is no intellectual understanding. Intellectual understanding is merely a verbal understanding. Hearing the words is not the understanding of their content. The word is not the thing. The word is not understanding. Understanding comes when the mind has ceased to make an effort, which means, when it does not put up a resistance, when it is not prejudiced, but listens freely and fully. And, if I may suggest, that is what we should try to do this evening; because then there is in listening a great delight—like listening to a poem, to a song, or seeing the movement of a tree. Then that very observation, listening, gives a tremendous significance to existence.

Religion, surely, is the uncovering of reality. Religion is not belief. Religion is not the search for truth. The search for truth is merely the fulfilment of belief. Religion is the understanding of the thinker; for what the thinker is, that he creates. Without understanding the process of the thinker and the thought, merely to be caught in a dogma is surely not the uncovering of the beauty of life, of existence, of truth. If you seek truth, then you already

truth. If you go out seeking something, the implication is that you have lost it, which means you already know what it is. What you do know is belief; and belief is not truth. No amount of belief, no amount of tradition, none of the religious ceremonies in which there are so many pre-conceptions of truth, lead to religion. Nor is religion the belief, the God of the irreligious, of the believer who does not believe.

Religion, surely, is allowing truth to come into being, whatever that truth is—not the truth that you want, for then it is merely the gratification of a particular desire which you call belief. So, it is necessary to have a mind that is capable of receiving whatever the truth is; and such a mind is possible only when you listen passively. Passive awareness comes into being when there is no effort, no suppression or sublimation; because, after all, to receive, there must be a mind that is not burdened with opinion or busy with its own chatter. Out of an opinion or a belief the mind can project an idea or an image of God; but it is a projection of itself, of its own chatter, of its own fabrication, and therefore it is not real. The real cannot be projected or invited, but can come into being only when the mind, the thinker, understands himself. Without understanding the thought and the thinker, there is no possibility of receiving truth, because the maker of effort is the thought, which is the thinker. Without thought, there is no thinker; and the thinker, seeking further security, takes refuge in an idea which he calls God, religion. But that is not religion, that is merely an extension of his own egotism, a projection of himself. It is a projected righteousness, a projected respectability; and this respectability cannot receive that which is truth. Most of us are very respectable, in the political, economic, or religious sense. We want to be something, here or in another world. The desire for — in another world, in a

different form, is still self-projection, it is still the worship of oneself; and such a projection is surely not religion. Religion is something much wider, much deeper than the projections of the self; and after all, your belief is a projection. Your ideals are self-projections, whether national or religious, and the following of such projections is obviously the gratification of the self, and therefore the enclosing of the mind within a belief; therefore it is not real.

Reality comes into being only when the mind is still, not made still. Therefore, there must be no disciplining of the mind to be still. When you discipline yourself, it is merely a projected desire to be in a particular state. Such a state is not the state of passivity. Religion is the understanding of the thinker and the thought, which means the understanding of action in relationship. The understanding of action in conduct is religion, not the worship of some idea, however gratifying, however traditional, whoever has said it. Religion is understanding the beauty, the depth, the extensive significance of action in relationship. Because, after all, life is relationship; to be, is to be related—otherwise you have no existence. You cannot live in isolation. You are related to your friends, to your family, to those with whom you work. Even though you withdraw to a mountain, you are related to the man who brings food; you are related to an idea which you have projected. Existence implies being, which is relationship; and if we do not understand that relationship, there is no understanding of reality. But because relationship is painful, disturbing, constantly changing in its demands, we escape from it to what we call God, which we think is the pursuit of reality. The pursuer cannot pursue the real. He can only pursue his own ideal, which is self-projected. So, our relationship and the understanding of it is true religion and nothing else is, be-

cause in that relationship is contained the whole significance of existence. In relationship, whether with people, with nature, with the trees, with the stars, with ideas, with the State—in that relationship is the whole uncovering of the thinker and the thought, which is man, which is mind. The self comes into being through the focus of conflict; the focussing of conflict gives self-consciousness to the mind. Otherwise there is no self; and though you may place that self on a high level, it is still the self of gratification.

So, the man who would receive reality, not seek reality, who would hear the voice of the eternal, whatever that eternal is, must understand relationship; because in relationship there is conflict, and it is that conflict which prevents the real. That is, in conflict there is the fixing of self-consciousness, which seeks to eschew, to escape conflict; but only when the mind understands conflict is it capable of receiving the real. So, without understanding relationship, the pursuit of the real is the pursuit of an escape, is it not? Why not face it? Without understanding the actual, how can you go beyond? You may close your eyes, you may run away to shrines and worship empty images; but the worship, the devotion, the puja, the giving of flowers, the sacrifices, the ideals, beliefs—all that has no meaning without understanding the conflict in relationship. So, the understanding of conflict in relationship is of primary importance and nothing else, for in that conflict you discover the whole process of the mind. Without knowing yourself as you are, not as you are technically supposed to be—God enclosed in matter, or whatever the theory is—but actually, in the conflict of daily existence, economic, social and ideological—without understanding that conflict, how can you go beyond and find something? The search for the beyond is merely an escape from what is; and if you want to escape,

then religion or God is as good an escape as drink. Don't object to this putting drink and God on the same level. All escapes are on the same level, whether you escape through drink, through puja, or whatever it be.

So, the understanding of conflict in relationship is of primary importance and nothing else; because out of that conflict we create the world in which we live every day—the misery, the poverty, the ugliness of existence. Relationship is response to the movement of life. That is, life is a constant challenge, and when the response is inadequate, there is conflict; but to respond immediately, truly, adequately to the challenge, brings about a completeness. In that response which is adequate to the challenge there is the cessation of conflict, and therefore it is important to understand oneself, not in abstraction, but in actuality, in every-day existence. What you are in daily life is of the highest importance; not what you think about or what you have ideas about, but how you behave to your wife, to your husband, to your children, to your employees. Because, from what you are, you create the world. Conduct is not an ideal conduct. There is no ideal conduct. Conduct is what you are from moment to moment, how you behave from moment to moment. The ideal is an escape from what you are. How can you go far when you do not know what is near you, when you are not aware of your wife? Surely, you must begin near to go far; but nevertheless your eyes are fixed on the horizon, which you call religion, and you have all the paraphernalia of belief to help you to escape.

So, what is important is not how to escape, because any escape is as good as another—the religious escapes and the worldly escapes are all the same, and escapes do not solve our problem. Our problem is conflict, not only the conflict

between individuals, but the world conflict. We see what is happening in the world—the increasing conflict of war, of destruction, of misery. That you cannot stop; all you can do is to alter your relationship with the world, not the world of Europe or America, but the world of your wife, your husband, your work, your home. There you can bring change, and that change moves in wider and wider circles; but without this fundamental change there can be no peace of mind. You may sit in a corner or read something to put yourself to sleep, which most people call meditation; but that is not the uncovering, the receiving of the real. What most of us want is a satisfying escape; we do not want to face our conflicts because they are too painful. They are painful only because we never look to see what they are all about; we seek something which we call God, but never look into the cause of conflict. But if we understand the conflict of everyday existence, then we can go further, because therein lies the whole significance of life. A mind that is in conflict is a destructive mind, a wasteful mind, and those in conflict can never understand; but conflict is not stilled by any sanctions, beliefs, or disciplines, because the conflict itself has to be understood. Our problem is in relationship, which is life; and religion is the understanding of that life, which brings about a state in which the mind is quiet. Such a mind is capable of receiving the real. That, after all, is religion—not your sacred threads, your pujas, your repetition of words, phrases and ceremonies. Surely, all that is not religion. Those are divisions, but a mind that is understanding relationship has no division. The belief that life is one is merely an idea and therefore has no value; but for a man who is understanding relationship there is no 'outsider' or 'insider', there is neither the foreigner nor the one who is near. Relationship is the process of under-

standing oneself, and to understand oneself from moment to moment in daily life is self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is not a religion, an ultimate end. There is no such thing as an ultimate end. There is such a thing for the man who wants to escape; but the understanding of relationship, in which there is ever-unfolding self-knowledge, is immeasurable.

So, self-knowledge is not the knowledge of the self placed at some high level; it is from moment to moment in daily conduct which is action, which is relationship; and without that self-knowledge there is no right thinking. You have no basis for right thinking if you do not know what you are. You cannot know yourself in abstraction, in ideology. You can know yourself only in relationship in your daily life. Don't you know that you are in conflict? And what is the good of going away from it, of avoiding it, like a man who has a poison in his system which he does not reject and who is therefore slowly dying? So, self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, and without that self-knowledge you cannot go far; and to seek the absolute, God, truth, or what you will, is merely the search after a self-projected gratification. Therefore, you must begin near and search every word that you speak, search every gesture, the way you talk, the way you act, the way you eat—be aware of everything without condemnation; then in that awareness you will know what actually is and the transformation of what is, which is the beginning of liberation. Liberation is not an end. Liberation is from moment to moment in the understanding of what is—when the mind is free, not made free. It is only a free mind that can discover, not a mind moulded by a belief or shaped according to an hypothesis. Such a mind cannot discover. There can be no freedom if there is conflict, for conflict

is the fixing of the self in relationship.

Many questions have been sent in, and naturally it is impossible to answer them all. We have therefore chosen some which seem to be representative, and if your question is not answered, don't feel that it has been overlooked. After all, all problems are related, and if I can understand one problem in its entirety, then I can understand all the related problems. So, listen to these questions as you would listen to the talk ; because questions are a challenge, and only in responding to them adequately do we find the problems resolved. They are a challenge to you as well as to me, and therefore let us think them out together and respond fully.

Question : What is right education ? As teachers and as parents we are confused.

KRISHNAMURTI : Now, how are we going to find the truth of this matter ? Merely forcing the mind into a system, a pattern, is obviously not education. So, to discover what is right education, we must find out what we mean by 'education'. Surely, education is not to learn the purpose of life, but to understand the meaning, the significance, the process of existence ; because if you say life has a purpose, then the purpose is self-projected. Surely, to find out what is right education, you have first to enquire into the whole significance of life, of living. What is present education ? Learning to earn a few rupees, acquiring a trade, becoming an engineer, a sociologist, learning how to butcher people, or how to read a poem. If you say education is to make a person efficient, which means to give him technical knowledge, then you must understand the whole significance of efficiency. What happens when a person becomes more and more efficient ? He becomes

more and more ruthless. Don't laugh. What are you doing in your daily life ? What is happening now in the world ? Education means the development of a particular technique, which is efficiency, which means industrialization, the capacity to work faster and produce more and more, all of which ultimately leads to war. You see this happening every day. Education as it is leads to war, and what is the point of education ? To destroy or be destroyed. So, obviously, the present system of education is utterly futile. Therefore, what is important is to educate the educator. These are not clever statements to be listened to and laughed off. Because, without educating the teacher, what can he teach the child except the exploiting principles on which he himself has been brought up ? Most of you have read many books. Where are you ? You have money or can earn it, you have your pleasures and ceremonies—and you are in conflict ; and what is the point of education, of learning to earn a few rupees, when your whole existence leads to misery and war ? So, right education, surely, must begin with the educator, the parent, the teacher ; and the enquiry into right education means enquiry into life, into existence, does it not ? What is the point of your being educated as a lawyer if you are only going to increase conflict and maintain litigation ? But there is money in that, and you thrive on it. So, if you want to bring about right education, you must obviously understand the meaning, the significance, of existence. It is not only to earn money, to have leisure, but to be able to think directly, truly—not 'consistently', because to think consistently is merely to conform to a pattern. A consistent thinker is a thoughtless person ; he merely repeats certain phrases and thinks in a groove. To find out what is right education, there must be the understanding of existence, which means the understanding of yourself ; be-

cause you cannot understand existence abstractly. You cannot understand yourself by theorizing as to what education should be. Surely, right education begins with the right understanding of the educator.

Look at what is happening in the world. Governments are taking control of education—naturally, because all governments are preparing for war. Your pet government, as well as the foreign government, must inevitably prepare for war. A sovereign government must have an army, a navy, an air force; and to make the citizens efficient for war, to prepare them to perform their duties thoroughly, efficiently, ruthlessly, the central government must control them. Therefore, they educate them as they manufacture mechanical instruments, to be ruthlessly efficient. If that is the purpose and end of education, to destroy or be destroyed, then it must be ruthless; and I am not at all sure that that is not what you want. Because, you are still educating your children in the same old fashion. Right education begins with the understanding of the educator, the teacher, which means that he must be free of established patterns of thought. Education is not merely imparting information, knowing how to read, gathering and correlating facts; but it is seeing the whole significance of education, of government, of the world situation, of the totalitarian spirit which is becoming more and more dominant throughout the world. Being confused you create the educator who is also confused, and through so-called education you give power to destroy the foreign government. Therefore, before you ask what right education is, you must understand yourself; and you will see that it does not take a long time to understand yourself if you are interested to find out. Sir, without understanding yourself as the educator, how can you bring about a new kind of education? Therefore we come back to the eternal point which

is yourself; and you want to avoid that point, you want to shift the responsibility onto the teacher, onto the government. The government is what you are, the world is what you are; and without understanding yourself, how can there be right education?

Question: What do you mean by living from moment to moment?

KRISHNAMURTI: A thing that continues can never be new. Just think it out and you will see—it is not a complicated problem. Surely, if I can complete each day and not carry over my worries, my tribulations, to the next, then I can meet tomorrow afresh. Meeting the challenge afresh is creation, and there can be no creation without ending. That is, you meet the new with the old; therefore there must be an ending of the old to meet the new. There must be an ending every minute, so that every minute is a new one. That is not a poetical imagination or indulgence. If you try, you will find out what happens. But, you see, we want to continue. We want to have continuation from moment to moment, from day to day, because we think without continuation we cannot exist.

Now, that which is capable of continuing, can that renew itself? Can that be new? Surely, there can be a new thing only when there is an ending. Your thought is continuous. Thought is the result of the past, thought is founded upon the past; it is a continuance of the past which in conjunction with the présent creates, modifies, the future. But the past, through the present, to the future, is still a continuity. There is no break. It is only when there is a break that you can see something new. Merely to continue the past modified by the present is not to perceive the new. Therefore, thought cannot perceive the new. Thought must end for the

new to be. But, you see what we are doing. We are using the present as a passage from the past to the future. Are we not doing that? To us, the present is not important. Thought, which is the present action, which is the present relationship, we do not think is important. We think what is important is the outcome, the result of thought, which is the future or the past. Have you not noticed how the old look to the past and also how the young sometimes look to the past or to the future? They are occupied with themselves in the past or in the future, but never give their full attention to the present. So, we use the present as a passage way to something else, and therefore there is no consideration, no observation of the present; and to observe the present, the past must end. Surely, to see what is, you cannot look through the past to the present. If I want to understand you, I must look at you directly, I must not bring up my past prejudices and through those prejudices look at you. Then I am only looking at my prejudices. I can look at you only when the prejudices are not; therefore there must be an end to prejudices.

So, to understand what is, which is action, which is relationship at every moment, there must be a freshness; therefore there must be an ending of the past; and this is not a theory. Experiment with it and you will see that this ending is not as difficult as you think. While you are listening, try it and you will see how easily and completely you can end thought and so discover. That is, when you are not induced, when you are interested in something vitally, profoundly, you are looking at it anew. The very interest drives away the past. You are only concerned to observe what is and to allow what is to tell its story. When you see the truth of this, your mind is emptied from moment to moment. Therefore the mind is discovering everything anew, and that is why

knowledge can never be new. It is only wisdom that is new. Knowledge can be taught in a school, but wisdom cannot be taught. A school of wisdom is nonsense. Wisdom is the discovery and the understanding of what is from moment to moment, and how can you be taught to observe what is? If you are taught, it is knowledge, then knowledge intervenes between you and the fact. Therefore knowledge is a barrier to the new, and a mind full of knowledge cannot understand what is. You are learned, are you not? And is your mind new? Or is it filled up with memorized facts? And a mind which becomes more and more a mere accumulation of facts,—how can such a mind see anything new? To see what is new, there must be an emptiness of past knowledge. Only in the discovery of what is from moment to moment is there the freedom which wisdom brings. Therefore, wisdom is something new, not repetitive, not something which you learn out of a school book or from Sankara, the *Bhagavadgita*, or Christ.

So, knowledge which is continued is a barrier to understanding the new. If in listening you bring in your previous knowledge, how can you understand? First you must listen. Sir, an engineer has knowledge of stresses and strains; but if he comes to build a bridge, he must first study the location and the soil. He must look at it independently of the structure which he is going to build, which means he must regard it anew, not merely copy from a book. But there is a danger in similes, so use it lightly. What is important is that there be a renewal in which there can be creation, that creative impulse, that sense of constant rebirth; and that can come into being only when there is death every minute. Such a mind can receive that which is truth. Truth is not something absolute, final, far away. It is to be discovered from moment to moment, and you cannot discover it in a state of

There can be no freedom in continuity. After all, continuity is memory, and how can memory be new? How can memory, which is experience, which is the past, understand the present? Only when the past is wholly understood and the mind is empty is it capable of seeing the present in all its significance. But most of our minds are not empty. They are filled with knowledge, and such a mind is not a thinking mind. It is only a repetitive mind, a gramophone changing the records according to circumstances. Such a mind is incapable of discovering the new. There is the new only in ending; but you are afraid of that. You are afraid of ending, and all your talk, your accumulation of facts, is merely a safeguard, an escape from that. Therefore, you are seeking continuity, but continuity is never new, in it there can be no renewal, no emptiness in which you can receive. So, the mind can renew itself only when it is empty, not when it is filled with your worries from day to day; and when the mind has come to an end there is a creation which is timeless.

Question : The more I listen to you, the more I feel the truth of the ancient teachings of Christ, Sankara, the Bhagavadgita and Theosophy. Have you really not read any of them?

KRISHNAMURTI : I will first answer the second part of the question, and then take up the first part. "Have you really not read any of them?" No, Sir, I have not read any of them. What is wrong with that? Are you surprised? Are you shocked? And why should you read them? Why do you want to read others' books when there is the book of yourself? Why do you want to read the Bible or Sankara? Surely, because you want confirmation, you want to conform. That is why most people read:

to be confirmed in what they believe or what they express, to be sure, to be safe, to be certain. Can you discover anything in certainty? Obviously not. A man who is certain psychologically can never discover. So, why do you read? You may read for mere amusement, or to accumulate facts; or you read to acquire what you call wisdom, and you think you have understood everything because you can quote Sankara; you think by quoting Sankara you have got the full significance of life. The man who quotes is a thoughtless man because he is merely repeating what somebody has said. Sirs, if you had no book, no *Bhagavadgita*, no Sankara, what would you do? You would have to take the journey by yourself into the unknown, you would have to venture out alone. When you discover something what you discover is yours; then you need no book. I have not read the *Bhagavadgita* nor any of the religious, psychological, or philosophical books, but I have discovered something, and that discovery can come only in freedom, not through repetition. That discovery is far greater than the experience of another, because discovery is not repetition, not copy.

Then, the first part of the question. Sir, why do you compare? What is the process of comparison? Why do you say, "what you say is like Sankara"? Whether it is or is not, is unimportant. Truth can never be the same, it is ever new. If it is the same, it is not truth, because truth is living from moment to moment, it cannot be today what it was yesterday. But why do you want to compare? Don't you compare in order to feel safe, in order to feel that you do not "have to think, since what I say is what Sankara said? You have read Sankara, and you think you have understood; so you compare and relax, which is all very quick and effortless. In fact, you have not understood, and that is

why you compare. When you compare, there is no understanding. To understand, you must look directly at the thing that is presented to you, and a mind that compares is a sluggish, wasteful mind; it is a mind that lives in security, that is enclosed in gratification. Such a mind cannot possibly understand truth. Truth is a living thing, not static, and a thing that is living is incomparable; it cannot be compared with the past or with the future. Truth is incomparable from moment to moment, and for a mind that tries to compare it, weigh it, judge it, there is no truth. For such a mind there is only propaganda, repetition; and repetition is a lie, it is not truth. You repeat because you are not experiencing, and a man who is experiencing never repeats, because truth is not repeatable. You cannot repeat truth, but your conclusion, your judgment about it can be repeated. Therefore, a mind that compares, that says, "What you are saying is exactly what Sankara said", such a mind merely wants to continue and so is enervated, dead.

Sir, there is no song in your heart if you merely repeat a song and therefore follow the singer. What is important is not whether I have read sacred books, or whether what I say is comparable to Sankara, the *Bhagavadgita*, or Christ, but what is important is why you repeat, why you compare. Understand why you compare, then you will be understanding yourself. The understanding of yourself is far more important than your understanding of Sankara, because you are far more important than Sankara or any ideology. It is only through you that you discover truth. You are the discoverer of truth, not Sankara, not the *Bhagavadgita*, which has no meaning—it is only a means of hypnotizing yourself, like reading the newspaper. So, a mind that is capable of receiving truth is a mind that does not compare, for truth is incomparable. To receive truth the

mind must be alone, and it is not alone when it is influenced by Sankara or Buddha. Therefore all influence, all conditioning, must cease. Only in that state when all knowledge has ceased is there an ending, and therefore the aloneness of truth.

Question : What exactly do you mean by meditation? Is it a process or a state?

KRISHNAMURTI : Though I talk and you listen, let us experience and discover together what is meditation. I am not going to teach you how to meditate, but together let us find out what is meditation. So, listen and experience as we go along, for words have meaning only when we move, when we journey together.

What is meditation? Meditation is the understanding of the meditator; the meditator is the meditation. Meditation is not exclusion, concentration. What do you mean by concentration? I am going to explain. We are taking a journey together: You are discovering and I am discovering, and the important thing is to discover, not merely to copy, to follow. Most of us consider that concentration is meditation, but it is not, and I will show you why it is not. Concentration means exclusion—focussing on one interest to the exclusion of other interests. You concentrate and resist; so, concentration is the focussing of resistance. You try to concentrate on a picture, on an image, on an idea, and your mind wanders to other interests; and the exclusive resistance of the various interests you call meditation. Surely, that concentration is not meditation, because in that effort there is conflict between that which resists and that which encroaches. That is, you spend your time in resisting, in battling, in disciplining against something. You spend days and years in this battle, till at last you can focus your mind on the object of your desire. The

object of your desire is self-projected, it is part of the thought process, it is of your own creation, and on that you try to focus; so, you are concentrating upon yourself, though you call it the ideal. Therefore it is an enclosing, exclusive process.

Now, meditation is not exclusion. We are discovering what meditation is interrogatively: to say what it is, is merely to copy. Only when you say what it is not, you say what it is. So, concentration is not meditation. When a schoolboy is interested in a toy, he has concentration. Surely, that is not meditation. The toy is not god, and the pursuit of virtue is not meditation. Let us see then what that means. The cultivation of virtue—is that virtue? To cultivate goodness—is that virtue? To say, "I am going to be brotherly" and meditate upon brotherliness—is that virtue? Such meditation upon virtue is merely self-calculation. Virtue implies freedom, and you are not free when you are plotting to become virtuous. So, the man who meditates daily to become virtuous, is not virtuous. It is a cloak, which is mere respectability. Sir, when you talk of humility, are you really humble, or are you only taking the cloak of humility? Do you know what it is to be humble? You cannot cultivate it. You cannot cultivate non-greediness. Because you are greedy, you want to be non-greedy. How can stupidity become intelligence? Where there is stupidity, there is no intelligence. Stupidity is what it is under all circumstances. Only with the ending of stupidity is there intelligence; only with the ending of greed is there freedom from greed. Therefore, virtue is freedom, not becoming something, which is endless continuity.

So, we see that concentration is not meditation, that pursuit of virtue is not meditation. Devotion obviously is not meditation, for the object of your devotion is self-projected. Your ideal is the outcome of your own

thinking. Obviously, Sir, your ideal is self-projected, is it not? You are this, and you want to become that. The *that* of your becoming is out of yourself, out of your own desire. You are violent, and you want to become non-violent. The ideal is within yourself. Therefore, your ideal is home-made. Therefore, when you give your devotion to the ideal, you are giving devotion to the thing which you have created. So, your devotion is self-gratification. You are not devoted to something which you do not like, which is painful. You are devoted to something which gives you pleasure, which means, obviously that it is self-created, and therefore that is not meditation. And it is not meditation to search for truth, because you cannot search for something which you do not know. You can only search for that which you know. If you know truth, it is no longer truth. What you know is the outcome of the past, of memory, therefore it is not truth. Therefore when you say, "Through meditation I am seeking truth", you are merely burdening the mind with your own creation, which is not truth. So, concentration, devotion, the pursuit of virtue, the search for truth, is not meditation.

Then, what is meditation? The things that we have been doing regularly, practising, disciplining, forcing the mind—obviously all that is not meditation, because in it there is no freedom; and only in freedom can truth come into being. Nor is prayer meditation, as we have discussed previously. When all that superstructure is removed from the mind—the pursuit of the ideal, the search for truth, the becoming virtuous, the concentration, the effort, the discipline, the condemning, the judging—, when all that is gone, what is the mind? When that is not, the meditator is not; therefore, there is meditation. When the meditator is not, there is meditation, but the meditator can never meditate. He can only medi-

tate upon himself, project himself, think about himself, but he knows no meditation. When the meditator understands himself and comes to an end, only then is there meditation ; for the ending of the meditator is meditation. Concentration, seeking truth, becoming virtuous, condemning, judging, disciplining—all that is the process of the meditator ; and without understanding the process of the meditator, there is no meditation. Therefore, without self-knowledge there is no meditation. There is no meditation without tranquillity of mind ; but tranquillity does not come about through the seeking or the directing of the meditator. When the whole, total process of the meditator is not, then there is a silence that is not brought about by the mind as an idea, as an ideal, which is self-projected gratification. But when the projector, the meditator, the self,

is completely absent, wholly ended, then there is silence which is not the product of the mind. Meditation is that silence which comes into being when the meditator and his processes are understood. That silence is inexhaustible ; it is not of time, therefore it is immeasurable. Only the meditator compares, judges, measures ; but when the measurement is not, the immeasurable is. Therefore, only when the mind is completely silent, completely still, tranquil, not projecting, not thinking—only then does the measureless come into being. But that measureless is not to be thought of. What you think about is the known, and the known cannot understand the unknown. Therefore, only when the known ends does the unknown come into being. Then only is there bliss.

December 4, 1949

I

TALK IN MADRAS

Perhaps if we can understand this whole problem of searching, seeking, we may be able to understand the complex problem of dissatisfaction and discontent. Most of us are seeking something at various levels of existence, physical comfort or psychological well-being ; or we say we are seeking truth or seeking wisdom. We are apparently always seeking something. Now, what does this mean, actually ? What is it that we are seeking ? We can only seek something that we know ; we cannot seek something that we do not know. We cannot search for something that we do not know exists ; we can only search for something that we have had and have lost. The search is the desire for satisfaction.

Most of us are dissatisfied both outwardly and inwardly ; and if we observe ourselves closely, we find that this discontent is merely the search for an enduring satisfaction

at different levels of existence which we call truth, happiness, understanding, or any other term. Basically, this urge is to find lasting gratification ; and being discontented with everything we do, finding no gratification in any of the things we have tried, we go from one teacher, one religion; one path, to another, hoping to find ultimate satisfaction. So, essentially our search is not for truth, but for satisfaction. Most of us are discontented, dissatisfied, with things as they are ; and our psychological, inward struggle is to find a permanent refuge ; whether the refuge is one of ideas or of immediate relationship, the basic urge is a desire to achieve complete satisfaction. This drive is what we call seeking.

We try various gratifications, various 'isms', communism included ; and when these do not satisfy, we turn to religion and pursue one guru after another, or we become cynics,

Cynicism also gives great satisfaction. Our search is always for a state of mind in which there will be no disturbance whatever, in which there will no longer be a struggle, but complete satisfaction. Is there the possibility of complete satisfaction in anything which the mind seeks? The mind is searching for its own projections, which are satisfying, gratifying; and the moment it finds one of these projections troublesome, it leaves it and goes to another. That is, we are seeking a psychological state which will be so pacifying, so reconciled, that it eliminates all conflicts. If we look into it deeply, we shall see that no such state is possible unless we are in illusion or attached to some form of psychological assertion.

Can discontent ever find permanent satisfaction? And what is it that we are discontented with? Are we seeking a better job, more money, a better wife, or a better religious formulation? If we examine it closely, we shall find that all our discontent is a search for permanent satisfaction—and that there can be no permanent satisfaction. Even physical security is impossible. The more we want to be secure, the more we become enclosed, nationalistic, ultimately leading to war. So, as long as we are seeking satisfaction, there must be ever-increasing conflict.

Is it possible ever to be content? What is contentment, actually? What brings contentment, how does it come about? Surely, contentment comes only when we understand what is. What brings discontent is the complex approach to what is. Because I want to change what is into something else, there is the struggle of becoming. But mere acceptance of what is also creates a problem. Surely, to understand what is, there must be passive watchfulness without the desire to change it into something else; which means that one must be passively aware of what is. Then it is possible to go beyond the mere

outward show of what is. What is is never static, though our response may be static.

Our problem, therefore, is not the search for an ultimate gratification which we call truth, God, or a better relationship, but the understanding of what is. To understand what is requires an extraordinarily swift mind which sees the futility of the desire to change what is into something else, of comparing or trying to reconcile what is with something else.

This understanding comes, not through discipline, control, or self-immolation, but through the removal of hindrances which prevent us from seeing what is directly.

There is no ending to satisfaction, it is continuous; and unless we see that, we are incapable of dealing with what is as it is. Direct relationship with what is is right action. Action based upon an idea is merely a self-projection. The idea, the ideal, the ideology, is all a part of the thought-process, and thought is a response to conditioning at any level. Therefore, the pursuit of an idea, of an ideal or an ideology, is a circle in which the mind is caught. When we see the whole process of the mind and all its crafty manoeuvring, only then is there understanding which brings transformation.

Question: We see inequality among men, and some are far above the rest of mankind. Surely, then, there must be higher types of beings like Masters and devas who may be deeply interested in co-operating with mankind. Have you contacted any of them? If so, can you tell us how we can contact them?

KRISHNAMURTI: Most of us are interested in gossip; and gossip is an extraordinarily stimulating thing, whether it is about Masters and devas, or about our neighbours. The more dull we are, the more we love gossip. When one is fed up with social gossip, one wants to gossip

about something higher. We are interested, not in the problem of inequality, but in gossipy titbits about strange entities we do not see, thus seeking a means of escaping from our shallowness. After all, the Masters and devas are your own projections; when you follow them, you follow your own projections. If they were to say to you, "Drop your nationalism, your societies, do not be greedy, do not be cruel", you would soon leave them and pursue others who would satisfy you. You want me to help you to contact the Masters. I am really not interested in the Masters. There is a lot of talk about them, and it has become a cunning means of exploiting people. We make a mess in the world, and we want a big brother to come and help us out of it. A great deal of that is cant. This division between Master and pupil, the hierarchical climbing of the ladder of success—is it really spiritual? This whole idea of hierarchical becoming, struggling to become what you call spiritual, to attain liberation—is it spiritual? When our hearts are empty, we fill them with the images of Masters, which means there is no love. When you love someone, you are not conscious of equality or inequality. Why are you so occupied with the question of Masters? The Masters are important to you because you have a sense of authority, and you give authority to something which has no authority. You give authority because it pleases you; it is self-flattery.

The problem of inequality is more fundamental than the desire to contact the Masters. There is inequality in capacity, in thought, in action—between the genius and the dull-witted man, the man who is free and the man who practises a routine. Every kind of revolution has tried to break this down, and in the process has created another inequality. The problem is how to go beyond the sense of inequality; of the inferior

and the superior. That is true spirituality—not seeking Masters and thereby maintaining the sense of inequality. The problem is not how to bring about equality, because equality is an impossibility. You are entirely different from another. You see more, you are much more alert than the other; you have a song in your heart, the other's heart is empty and to him a dead leaf is a dead leaf which he burns. Some people have extraordinary capacity, they are swift and capable. Others are slow, dull, unobserving. There is no end to physical and psychological differences, and you cannot break them down—that is an utter impossibility. All that you can do is to give an opportunity to the dull and not kick him, not exploit him. You cannot make him a genius.

So the problem is not how to contact Masters and devas but how to transcend the sense of inequality; seeking to contact Masters is the pursuit of the very, very dull. When you know yourself you know the Master. A real Master cannot help you, because you have to understand yourself. We are all the time pursuing phony Masters; we seek comfort, security, and we project the kind of Master we want, hoping that Master will give us all that we desire. Since there is no such thing as comfort, the problem is much more fundamental, that is, how to go beyond this sense of inequality. Wisdom is not the struggle to become more and more.

Now, is it possible to transcend the sense of inequality? For inequality is there, we cannot deny it. What happens when we do not deny inequality, when we do not come to it with a prejudiced mind, but face it? There is the dirty village, and there is also the nice clean house: both are what is. How do you approach ugliness and beauty? In that lies the solution. The beautiful you wish to be identified with, and the ugly you put aside. For the inferior

you have no consideration, but for the superior you have the greatest consideration and deference. Your approach is identification with the higher, and rejection of the lower; you look upward with cringing, and downward with contempt.

Inequality can be transcended only when we understand our approach to it. As long as we resist the ugly and identify ourselves with the beautiful, there is bound to be all this misery. But, if we approach inequality without condemnation, identification, or judgment, then our response is entirely different. Please try it, and you will see what an extraordinary change occurs in your life. The understanding of what is brings contentment—which is not the contentment of stagnation, not the contentment caused by the possession of property, of an idea, of a woman. Contentment is the state of approach to what is as it is, without any barrier whatsoever. Then only is there love, the love which destroys the sense of inequality; and this is the only thing that is revolutionary, that can transform. Since we have not that flame of revolution, we fill our hearts and minds with ideas of revolution of the left or the right, the modification of what has been. That way there is no hope. The more you reform, the greater the need for further reforms.

It is not important to know how to contact the Masters, for they have no significance in life. What is important is to understand yourself, otherwise your Master is an illusion. Without understanding yourself you are creating more and more misery in the world. Look at what is happening in the world and see the narrow spirit displayed by the zealous votaries of peace, of the Masters, of love and brotherhood. You are all out for yourselves, though you wrap it up in beautiful words. You want the Masters to help you to become more glorified and self-enclosed.

I know I have answered this question at different times in different

ways. I also know that, in spite of all I say, you are going to perform your rituals and rattle your swords for king and country. You do not want to understand and solve this problem of inequality. People have written to me saying, "You are very ungrateful to the Masters who have brought you up". It is so easy to make these statements. It is all cant. One has to discover for oneself that no Master can help one. Is it ungrateful to see that which is false and say it is false? You want me to be grateful to your idea, to your formulation of a Master; and when your ideas are disturbed, you call me ungrateful. The problem is not one of gratitude to the Masters, but of understanding yourself.

There is great joy in understanding and discovering what you are, the whole content of what you are, from moment to moment. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Without self-knowledge, you cannot know anything—or if you know something, you will misuse it. To pursue the Master is easy; but to have self-knowledge, to be passively watchful of every thought and feeling, is arduous. You cannot watch if there is judgment or identification; for identification and judgment prevent understanding. If you watch passively, the thing that you watch begins to unfold, and then there is understanding which renews itself from moment to moment.

Question: In one of your talks you have stated that if a person prays, he receives, but he will pay for it in the end. What do you mean by this? What is the entity that grants our prayers, and why do we not succeed in getting all that we pray for?

KRISHNAMURTI: Are you not happy that all you pray for is not granted? Would that not be deadly boring? You should see the whole

picture, not only the part you like. Most of you pray to be satisfied. Your prayers are petitions, supplications for help to get away from your own confusion. Obviously, you pray only when you are confused, in trouble, unhappy. You do not pray when you are joyous, but only when there is fear and when there is pain. What happens when you pray? Please experiment with yourself and watch what happens. When you pray, you quiet the mind by the repetition of certain phrases; that is, the mind is made quiet, is drugged, by repeating a word or by looking at a picture or an image. When the superficial mind is quiet, into that upper layer of the mind comes the response which is most satisfactory. Mass prayer also has a similar effect. You supplicate, you put out the begging bowl to receive; you want gratification, you want an escape from your confusion. So, when the mind is drugged into insensitivity or is partly asleep, into it is projected unconsciously the satisfying answer, which is the general influence of the world about you. There is the collective reservoir of greed, of the universal demand away from what is; and when you tap it, you obviously get what you want. But that reservoir—is it God, the ultimate truth? Please do look at it, watch it closely, and you will see.

When you pray to God, you pray to something with which you have a relationship, and you can have a relationship only with what you know; therefore your 'God' is a projection of yourself, either inherited or acquired. When the mind is begging, it will have an answer, but that answer will always be more enclosing and more troublesome, and will create further problems. That is the price you pay. When you sing or chant together, you are only avoiding, seeking an escape from what is. The escapes have their satisfactions; but their price is, that you

have yet to meet the problem which pursues you like a shadow. Your prayers may be gratifying most of the time; but you are in misery all the time, and you want to run away. Your search is the search of avoidance. To understand requires watchfulness, knowing every thought, every gesture. But you are lazy; you have convenient escapes which help you to avoid the understanding of yourself, the creator of pain. Until you understand the problem of yourself, your ambitions, your greed, your exploitation, your desire to maintain inequality; until you face the fact that you are the creator of pain and suffering in the world, of what value are your prayers? You are the problem, you cannot ultimately avoid it; and you can dissolve it only by understanding the whole of it.

So, your prayer is a hindrance to understanding. There is a different kind of prayer—a state of mind where there is no demand, no supplication. In that prayer—perhaps this is a wrong word to use—there is no forward movement, no denial; it is not put together, it cannot be brought about by any kind of trick. That state of mind is not seeking a result, it is still; it cannot be thought of, practised, or mediated upon. That state of mind alone can discover and allow truth to come into being, and it alone will solve our problem. That quiet state of mind comes when what is is observed and understood; and then the mind is capable of receiving the inexhaustible.

Question: There is widespread misery in the world, and all religions have failed; yet you seem to be talking religion more and more. Will any religion help us to be free from misery?

KRISHNAMURTI: We must find out what we mean by religion. Religions have failed throughout the world,

perhaps, because we are not religious. You may call yourselves by certain names, but your beliefs, your images, your incense-burning, are not religious at all. To you, all these have become important—not religion. Look at what we have done throughout the world. Ideas have set man against man. The extension of dogma is not freedom from dogma. Belief is separating people. Separation is the emphasis of belief, and it is a good means of exploiting the credulous. In belief, you find comfort, security—which is all illusion. Wherever there is a tendency to separateness, there must be disintegration. Where there is the enclosing force of belief, there must be disintegration. You call yourselves Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Theosophists, and what not, and thereby you enclose yourselves. Your ideas create opposition, enmity, and antagonism; so also your philosophies, however clever, idealistic and amusing. As a man is addicted to drink, you are addicted to your beliefs. That is why organized religions have failed throughout the world.

True religion is experiencing, and it has nothing to do with belief. It is that state of mind which, in the process of self-knowledge, discovers truth from moment to moment. Truth is not continuous, it is never the same, it is incomparable. Truth is the alone; it is not the symbol of anything. The worship of any symbol brings about disaster, and a mind that is addicted to belief in any form can never be a religious mind. It is only the religious mind, not the ideological mind, that is capable of solving the problem. Quoting others is no good. A mind that quotes, whether it be Plato or Buddha, is incapable of experiencing reality. To experience reality, the mind must be completely stripped; and such a mind is not a seeking mind.

Religion, therefore, is not belief; religion is not ceremonies; religion is

not an idea, or various ideas put together to form an ideology. Religion is experiencing the truth of what is from moment to moment. Truth is not an ultimate end—there is no ultimate end to truth. Truth is in what is; it is in the present, it is never static. A mind that is clouded with the past cannot possibly understand truth. All religions, as they are, divide man. The beliefs of these religions are not truth. Truth is not to be found in any belief in reincarnation; truth is experienced only when there is an ending, the ending which is implied in death. Your belief in God is not religion, is not truth. There is little difference between the believer and the non-believer; they are both conditioned by their respective environments; they bring separation in the world, through ideas, through beliefs. Therefore, neither the believer nor the non-believer can experience reality.

When you see things as they are without any prejudice, without praise or condemnation, in direct relationship with what is, there is action. When the idea intervenes, there is postponement of action. The mind which is the structure of ideas, the residue of all memories and thoughts, can never find reality. Your reading and quoting will not help you to experience reality. Reality must come to you. You can search only for something that you know; you cannot search for reality. Please do see the truth of this matter, see the beauty of the mind that is experiencing directly and therefore acting without a reward, without a punishment. But experience is not the criterion of truth. Experience only nurtures memory. Your self is thought, and thought is memory; experience is memory as thought. Therefore, such a mind can organize the word 'truth' and exploit people; but it is incapable of experiencing reality. Only the mind that has no idea can experience reality.

A religious man is the truly revolutionary man. The man who acts on ideas may kill others. In direct relationship with what is there is experiencing, and such a mind is no longer fabricating ideas. A mind that has no idea is sensitive, is able to see what is directly, and is therefore capable of action. Such action alone is revolutionary.

Question : It has been said that the acquirement of wisdom is the ultimate goal of life, and that wisdom has to be sought little by little through a life of purification and dedication, with the mind and the emotions directed to high ideals through prayer and meditation. Do you agree ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Let us find out what you mean by wisdom, and then see whether we can find that wisdom. What do you mean by wisdom ? Is it the goal of life ? If it is, and if you know the goal, the purpose of life, then wisdom is the known. Can you know or acquire wisdom, or can you only know facts, acquire knowledge ? Surely, knowledge and wisdom are two separate things. You may know all about something ; but, is that wisdom ? Is wisdom to be acquired little by little, life after life ? Is wisdom the storing up of experience ? Acquisition implies accumulation ; experience implies residue. Residue, accumulation—is that wisdom ? You have already accumulated the racial, the inherited residues in conjunction with the present. Is that process of accumulation, wisdom ? You accumulate to safeguard yourself, to live secure ; you acquire experience gradually. The accumulation of knowledge, the slow gathering of experience—is that wisdom. Your whole life is accumulation, acquiring more and more. Will that make you wise ? You have acquired something, you have had an experience which has left a residue ; and that residue conditions your further

experience. Your response is this experience, and it is the continuation of the background in a different way. So when you say that wisdom is experience, you mean the collection of many experiences. Why are you not wise ? Can the man who is constantly acquiring, be wise ? Can the man burdened with experience, be wise ? Can the man who knows, be wise ? The man who knows is not wise, and the man who does not know is wise. Do not smile and pass it off.

When you know, you have experienced, you have accumulated ; and the projection of that accumulation is further knowledge. Therefore, wisdom is not a slow process, it is not to be gathered little by little like a bank account. To believe that gradually through several lives you are going to become Buddha, is immature thinking and feeling. Such statements appear wonderful, especially when ascribed to a Master. When you enquire to find out the truth, then you will see it is only your own projection that wants to continue to experience the same thing as before.

So, accumulation is never wisdom, because there can be accumulation only of what is known ; and what is known, can never be the unknown. The emptying of the mind is not a slow process ; but trying to empty it is a hindrance. If you say, "I will empty the mind", then it is the same old process. Just see the truth that a mind that is acquiring can never be wise—in six lives or in ten. A man who has acquired is already rich ; and a rich man is never wise. You want to be rich in knowledge, which is the acquisition of experience in words ; but the man who has, can never be wise. Also, the man who deliberately has not, can never be wise.

Truth cannot be accumulated. It is not experience. It is experiencing in which there is neither the experiencer nor the experience. Knowledge always has the accumulator,

the gatherer; but wisdom has no experiencee. Wisdom is as love is; and without that love, we attempt to pursue wisdom through continuous acquisition. What continues must decay. Only that which ends can know wisdom. Wisdom is ever fresh, ever new. How can you know the new if there is continuity? There is continuity as long as you are continuing experience. Only when there is ending is there the new, which is creative. But, we want to continue, we want accumulation, which is the continuity of experience; and such a mind can never know wisdom. It can only know its own projection, its own creations, and the reconciliation between its creations. Truth is wisdom. Truth cannot be sought out. Truth comes only when the mind is empty of all knowledge, of all thought, of all experience; and that is wisdom.

December 18, 1949

II

TALK IN MADRAS

Let us see what place the individual has in society, whether the individual can do anything to bring about a radical change in society; whether the transformed entity, the intelligent human being who has fundamentally transformed himself, has any influence, any action, upon the current of events; or, whether the individual I am talking of, the transformed entity, cannot do anything himself but can, merely by his very existence, inject some kind of order into society, into the stream of chaos and confusion. We see all over the world that mass action obviously produces results. Seeing that, we feel that individual action has very little importance, that you and I, though we may transform ourselves, can have very little influence; and so we ask what value do we have when we cannot affect the stream.

Now, why do we think in mass terms? Are fundamental revolutions brought about by the mass, or are they started by the few who see and who, by their talk and energy, influence very many people? That is how revolutions are brought about. Is it not a mistake to think that, as individuals, we cannot do anything? Is it not a fallacy to think that all fundamental revolutions are produced by the mass? Why do we think that individuals are not important as individuals? If we have this attitude of mind, we will not think for ourselves, but will respond automatically. Is action always of the mass? Does it not spring essentially from the individual, and then spread from individual to individual? There is really no such thing as the mass. After all, the mass is an entity formed of people who are caught, hypnotized by words, by certain ideas. The moment we are not hypnotized by words, we are outside that stream—something no politician would like. Should we not remain outside the stream, and collect more and more from the stream, in order to affect the stream? Is it not important that there should be a fundamental transformation in the individual first, that you and I should radically change first, without waiting for the whole world to change? Is it not an escapist's view, a form of laziness, an avoidance of the issue, to think that you and I, in however small a degree, cannot affect society as a whole?

When we see so much misery, not only in our own lives but also in the society around us, what is it that prevents us from transforming ourselves, from changing ourselves fundamentally? Is it merely habit, lethargy, the quality of the mind that likes the pattern in which it is enclosed and does not want it to break? Surely, it is not only that, because, economic circumstances break up that pattern; but the inward psychological pattern persists. Why

does it persist? In order to change fundamentally, radically, do we need an outside influence or agency—like sorrow, economic or social revolution, or a *guru*—, all of which are a form of compulsion? An outside agency implies conformity, dependence, compulsion, fear. Do we change fundamentally through dependence? And is it not one of our difficulties that we are dependent for change on outside agencies, economic upheavals, and so on? This dependence upon an outside agency prevents radical revolution, because radical revolution can come about only in understanding the total process of oneself. If you depend on an outside agency of any kind to bring about transformation, you have introduced fear and certain other factors which actually prevent transformation. A man who really wants transformation does not depend upon any outside agency, he has no struggle within himself; he sees the necessity, and transforms himself.

Is the transformation of the individual really difficult? Is it difficult to be kind, to be compassionate, to love somebody? After all, that is the very essence of a radical transformation. The difficulty with us is that we have a dualistic nature in which there is hate, dislike, various forms of antagonism, and so on, which takes us away from the central issue. We are so caught up in the impulses that incite hatred, dislike, that the very flame is lost, and we are left with the smoke; and then our problem is how to get rid of the smoke. We have not got the flame of creation at all, but we think the smoke is the flame. Is it not necessary to investigate what the flame is, that is, see things anew without being caught in a pattern, look at things as they are without naming them? Is it really difficult? The difficulty with most of us is that we have committed ourselves up to the hilt, we have assumed innumerable responsibilities, duties, and so on, and we

say that we cannot get out of them. Surely, that is not a real difficulty. When we feel something deeply we do what we want to do, irrespective of the family, of society, and all that. So, the only difficulty which stands in the way is that we do not sufficiently feel the importance of radical individual transformation. It is imperative to bring about transformation. Transformation will take place when we live without verbalization, when we see things as they are and accept truth as it is. It must begin with us as individuals. It does not begin merely because we do not pay enough attention, we do not give our whole being to the understanding of this one thing; we see so much misery outside of us and confusion within us, and yet we do not want to break through it.

Now, what happens when I have a problem and try to resolve it? In the resolution of that problem, I find several others that have come in; in solving one problem, I have multiplied it. So, I want to find the solution to the problem without increasing the problem, I want to live happily, I want to be free of psychological sorrow without finding a substitute for it. Is it possible to find out if one can really resolve sorrow, to enquire into it without anybody's authority, to go into it in oneself, watching oneself all the time in every kind of relationship? Is not that the only way out of the difficulty?—watching ourselves constantly, what we think, what we feel, what we do, being in that state of watchfulness in which everything is revealed. You must experiment with it and not merely say it cannot be done, or accept my authority and merely repeat it. Let us say that you are happy and I am not; and I want to be happy, I do not want to be drugged by belief and all that, but I want to go to the very end of it. So I come to you and enquire, and I go deeper and deeper into it. What is

preventing you from doing that now ? Why is it you do not have the feeling of happiness, of creation, of seeing things as they are ? Why do you not operate in that deep sense ? Because you say that sorrow is helpful to happiness, that sorrow is a means to happiness, and you have accepted sorrow, or some kind of substitution. We have made ourselves so dull that we do not see the need for changing, that is the difficulty.

You may say that you want to change, but that there is something which prevents the change from taking place. Explanations will not bring about change. To say that the ego is in the way, is explanation, mere description. You want me to describe how to overcome the impediments ; but we must find a way of jumping the hurdle if we can, we must venture out into the stream and see what happens—not sit on the shore and speculate. What is actually preventing us from taking the jump ? Tradition which is memory, which is experience, prevents us, does it not ? We are so satisfied with words, with explanations, that we do not take the jump, even when we see the necessity for jumping. It is suggested that there is no venturing out in the stream because of fear of the unknown. But can I ever know what will happen, can I ever know the unknown ? If I knew, then I would have no fear—and it would not be the unknown. I can never know the unknown without venturing.

Is it fear that is holding us from venturing forth ? What is fear ? Fear can exist only in relation to something, it is not in isolation. How can I be afraid of death, how can I be afraid of something I do not know ? I can be afraid only of what I know. When I say I am afraid of death, am I really afraid of the unknown, which is death, or am I afraid of losing what I have known ? My fear is not of death, but of losing my association with things belonging to me.

My fear is always in relation to the known, not to the unknown.

So, my enquiry now is how to be free from the fear of the known, which is the fear of losing my family, my reputation, my character, my bank account, my appetites, and so on. You may say that fear arises from conscience ; but your conscience is formed by your conditioning, it may be foolish or wise ; so, conscience is still the result of the known. What do I know ? Knowing is having ideas, having opinions about things, having a sense of continuity as the known, and no more. Ideas are memories, the result of experience, which is response to challenge. I am afraid of the known, which means I am afraid of losing people, things or ideas, I am afraid of discovering what I am, afraid of being at a loss, afraid of the pain which might come into being when I have lost, or have not gained, or have no more pleasure.

There is fear of pain. Physical pain is the nervous response ; psychological pain arises when I hold on to things that give me satisfaction, for then I am afraid of anyone or anything that may take them away from me. The psychological accumulations prevent psychological pain as long as they are undisturbed ; that is, I am a bundle of accumulations, experiences, which prevent any serious form of disturbance—and I do not want to be disturbed. Therefore, I am afraid of any one who disturbs them. Thus my fear is of the known, I am afraid of the accumulations, physical or psychological, that I have gathered as a means of warding off pain or preventing sorrow. But sorrow is in the very process of accumulating to ward off psychological pain. Knowledge also helps to prevent pain. As medical knowledge helps to prevent physical pain, so beliefs help to prevent psychological pain, and that is why I am afraid of losing my beliefs, though I have no perfect knowledge or concrete proof

of the reality of such beliefs. I may reject some of the traditional beliefs that have been foisted on me, because my own experience gives me strength, confidence, understanding; but such beliefs and the knowledge which I have acquired are basically the same—a means of warding off pain.

Fear exists as long as there is accumulation of the known, which creates the fear of losing. Therefore, fear of the unknown is really fear of losing the accumulated known. Accumulation invariably means fear, which in turn means pain; and the moment I say, 'I must not lose', there is fear. Though my intention in accumulating is to ward off pain, pain is inherent in the process of accumulation. The very things which I have created fear, which is pain.

The seed of defence brings offence. I want physical security; thus I create a sovereign government, which necessitates armed forces, which means war, which destroys security. Wherever there is a desire for self-protection, there is fear. When I see the fallacy of demanding security, I do not accumulate any more. If you say that you see it but you cannot help accumulating, it is because you do not really see that, inherently, in accumulation there is pain.

Fear exists in the process of accumulation, and belief in something is part of the accumulative process. My son dies, and I believe in reincarnation to prevent me psychologically from having more pain; but in the very process of believing, there is doubt. Outwardly I accumulate things, and bring war; inwardly I accumulate beliefs, and bring pain. As long as I want to be secure, to have bank accounts, pleasures, and so on, as long as I want to become something, physiologically or psychologically, there must be pain. The very things I am doing to ward off pain, bring me fear, pain.

Fear comes into being when I desire to be in a particular pattern. To live without fear means to live without a particular pattern. When I demand a particular way of living, that in itself is a source of fear. My difficulty is my desire to live in a certain frame. Can I not break the frame? I can do so only when I see the truth: that the frame is causing fear, and that this fear is strengthening the frame. If I say I must break the frame because I want to be free of fear, then I am merely following another pattern, which will cause further fear. Any action on my part based on the desire to break the frame will only create another pattern, and therefore fear. How am I to break the frame without causing fear, that is, without any conscious or unconscious action on my part with regard to it? This means that I must not act, I must make no movement to break the frame. So, what happens to me when I am simply looking at the frame without doing anything about it? I see that the mind itself is the frame, the pattern; it lives in the habitual pattern which it has created for itself. So, the mind itself is fear. Whatever the mind does, goes towards strengthening an old pattern or furthering a new one. This means that whatever the mind does to get rid of fear, causes fear. Seeing the truth of all this, seeing the process of it, what happens? The mind becomes sensitive, quiet.

Now, why is not the mind quiet all the time? Each time the pattern crystallizes, why does not the mind see the truth of 'it'? Because, the mind wants permanency, stability, a refuge from which it can act. The mind wants to be secure. There is the breaking up of one particular pattern, and a few minutes later there is again crystallization; and instead of examining this new crystallization and understanding it fully, the mind goes back to the old experience and says, 'I have seen the truth, and that must continue'. In seeking

continuation, the mind creates a new pattern and gets caught in it. Each time the crystallization takes place, it has to be watched and understood; and the repetition occurs because of the incompleteness of understanding.

Truth is non-continuity. The truth of yesterday is not the truth of today. Truth is not of time, and so not of memory; it is not something to be experienced, to be remembered, gained, lost or achieved. We pursue truth in order to gain it and give it a continuity; and once we really see this, then the pattern will break up, because then the mind is already adrift.

January 29, 1950

III

TALK IN MADRAS

In all our relationships—with people, with nature, with ideas, with things—we seem to create more and more problems. In trying to solve one problem, whether economic, political, social, collective or individual, we introduce many other problems. We seem somehow to breed more and more conflict, and need more and more reform. Obviously, all reform needs further reform, and therefore it is really retrogression. As long as revolution, whether of the left or the right, is merely the continuity of what has been in terms of what shall be, it also is retrogression. There can be fundamental revolution, a constant inward transformation, only when we, as individuals, understand our relationship to the collective. The revolution must begin with each one of us and not with external, environmental influences. After all, we are the collective; both the conscious and the unconscious in us is the residue of all the political, social, cultural influences of man. Therefore, to bring about a fundamental outward revolution, there must be a radical transformation within each one of

us, a transformation which does not depend on environmental change. It must begin with you and me. All great things start on a small scale, all great movements begin with you and me as individuals; and if we wait for collective action, such collective action, if it takes place at all, is destructive and conducive to further misery.

So, revolution must begin with you and me. That revolution, that individual transformation, can take place only when we understand relationship, which is the process of self-knowledge. Without knowing the whole process of my relationship at all the different levels, what I think and what I do has no value at all. What basis have I for thinking if I do not know myself? We are so desirous to act, so eager to do something, to bring some kind of revolution, some kind of amelioration, some change in the world; but without knowing the process of ourselves both at the periphery and inwardly, we have no basis for action, and what we do is bound to create more misery, more strife. The understanding of oneself does not come through the process of withdrawal from society, or through retirement into an ivory tower. If you and I really go into the matter carefully and intelligently, we will see that we can understand ourselves only in relationship and not in isolation. Nobody can live in isolation. To live is to be related. It is only in the mirror of relationship that I understand myself—which means that I must be extraordinarily alert in all my thoughts, feelings and actions in relationship. This is not a difficult process or a super-human endeavour; and as with all rivers, while the source is hardly perceptible, the waters gather momentum as they move, as they deepen. In this mad and chaotic world, if you go into this process advisedly, with care, with patience, without condemning, you will see how it begins to gather momentum and that it is not a matter of time.

Truth is from moment to moment in relationship, it is to see each action, each thought and feeling as it arises in relationship. Truth is not something that can be accumulated, stored up; it has to be found anew in the moment of thought and feeling at every moment—which is not an accumulative process and is not therefore a matter of time. When you say you will eventually understand through experience or knowledge, you are preventing that very understanding, because understanding does not come through accumulation. You can accumulate knowledge, but that is not understanding. Understanding comes when the mind is free of knowledge. When the mind does not demand the fulfilment of desires, when it is not seeking out experience, there is stillness; and when the mind is still, then only can there be understanding. It is only when you and I are quite willing to see things clearly as they are that there is a possibility of understanding. Understanding comes, not through discipline, through compulsion, through enforcement, but when the mind is quiet and willing to see things clearly. Quietness of mind is never brought about by any form of compulsion, conscious or unconscious; it must be spontaneous. Freedom is not at the end, but at the beginning; because the end and the beginning are not different, the means and the end are one. The beginning of wisdom is the understanding of the total process of oneself, and that self-knowledge, that understanding, is meditation.

Question : We all experience loneliness, we know its sorrow and see its causes, its roots. But what is loneliness? Is it different from loneliness?

KRISHNAMURTI: Loneliness is the pain, the agony of solitude, the state of isolation when you as an entity do not fit in with anything,

neither with the group, nor with the country, with your wife, with your children, with your husband; you are cut off from others. You know that state. Now, do you know aloneness? You take it for granted that you are alone; but are you alone?

Aloneness is different from loneliness, but you cannot understand it if you do not understand loneliness. Do you know loneliness? You have surreptitiously watched it, looked at it, not liking it. To know it, you must commune with it with no barrier between it and you, no conclusion, prejudice or speculation; you must come to it with freedom and not with fear. To understand loneliness, you must approach it without any sense of fear. If you come to loneliness saying that you already know the cause of it, the roots of it, then you cannot understand it. Do you know its roots? You know them by speculating from outside. Do you know the inward content of loneliness? You merely give it a description, and the word is not the thing, the real. To understand it, you must come to it without any sense of getting away from it. The very thought of getting away from loneliness is in itself a form of inward insufficiency. Are not most of our activities an avoidance? When you are alone, you switch on the radio, you do pujas, run after gurus, gossip with others, go to the cinema, attend races, and so on. Your daily life is to get away from yourselves, so the escapes become all-important and you wrangle about the escapes—whether drink, or God. The avoidance is the issue, though you may have different means of escape. You may do enormous harm psychologically by your respectable escapes, and I sociologically by my worldly escapes: but to understand loneliness, all escapes must come to an end—not through enforcement, compulsion, but by seeing the falseness of escape.

Then you are directly confronting what is, and the real problem begins.

What is loneliness? To understand it, you must not give it a name. The very naming, the very association of thought with other memories of it, emphasizes loneliness. Experiment with it and see. When you have ceased to escape you will see that, till you realize what loneliness is, anything you do about it is another form of escape. Only by understanding loneliness can you go beyond it.

The problem of aloneness is entirely different. We are never alone; we are always with people except, perhaps, when we go for solitary walks. We are the result of a total process made up of economic, social, climatic and other environmental influences; and as long as we are influenced, we are not alone. As long as there is the process of accumulation and experience, there can never be aloneness. You can imagine that you are alone by isolating yourself through narrow individual, personal activities; but that is not aloneness. Aloneness can be, only when influence is not. Aloneness is action which is not the result of a reaction, which is not the response to a challenge or a stimulus. Loneliness is a problem of isolation, and we are seeking isolation in all our relationships, which is the very essence of the self, the 'me'—my work, my nature, my duty, my property, my relationship. The very process of thought, which is the result of all the thoughts and influences of man, leads to isolation. To understand loneliness is not a bourgeois act; you cannot understand it as long as there is in you the ache of that undisclosed insufficiency which comes with emptiness, frustration. Aloneness is not an isolation, it is not the opposite of loneliness; it is a state of being when all experience and knowledge are not.

Question: You have been talking for a number of years about trans-

formation. Do you know of anyone who has been transformed in your sense of the word?

KRISHNAMURTI: What is the point of your singing, what is the point of your laughter? Do you laugh, do you smile, in order to convince somebody, to make somebody happy? If you have a song in your heart, you sing. So it is with my talking. It is your responsibility to transform yourself, and not mine. You want to know if anyone has been transformed. I don't know. I have not looked to see who has been transformed and who has not been. It is your life of sorrow, of misery, and I am not the judge. You are yourself the judge. Neither you nor I are propagandists. To do propaganda is to tell a lie; to see truth is quite a different matter. If you who are responsible for this misery, chaos, corruption, these degrading wars, do not see that you are responsible and that you must transform yourselves to bring about a revolution in the world, it is your affair. Unless you want to change, you will not change. You cannot be a singer by listening to songs; but if you have a song in your heart, you will not be repetitive.

The important thing in this is to find out why you listen so much and so often, why you come and listen at all. Why do you waste your time if you are not doing anything about it? Why are you not changed? I am not putting this question to you—you should put it to yourself. When you see so much misery, so much corruption—not only in your individual life, but in your social relationship and in every political endeavour—, what do you do about it? Why are you not interested in this? Merely reading the newspaper is obviously no solution. Is it not a vital matter to find out what you are doing and why? Most of us are dull, insensitive to the whole process that is going on around us, though the things in front of us demand action. Why

are you dull, insensitive? Is it not because of your worship of authority, political or religious? You have read the *Bhagavad Gita* and so many other books, which you can repeat like parrots, but you have not even one thought of your own; and the man who can repeat in a nice voice, who explains texts over and over again, you worship. So, authority dulls the mind, and imitation or repetition makes the mind insensitive, unpliant. That is why *gurus* multiply and followers destroy. You want direction, and the desire for direction is the building up of authority; and being caught in authority, your minds, seeking comfort, seeking satisfaction, become insensitive, dull. The performance of rituals or the constant reading of a so-called sacred book is the same as having a drink. What would you do if there were no books? You would have to think everything out for yourself; you would have to search, find out, enquire every moment to discover, to understand the new. Are you not in that position now? All the social and political systems have come to nothing, though they promise everything; and yet you go on reading religious books and repeating what you have read, which makes your mind dull. Your education is merely the accumulation of book knowledge to pass an examination or to get a job. Thus you yourself have made your mind dull, and your knowledge has corrupted you.

So, your transformation is your own problem. What need have you to find out who has or who has not transformed himself? If you have beauty within you, you do not seek. A happy man does not seek; it is the man who is unhappy that seeks. Unhappiness is not resolved by search, but only by understanding, by watching every gesture, spontaneously seeing every one of your thoughts and feelings so that it reveals its story. Then only is truth discovered.

Question: You have never talked about the future. Why? Are you afraid of it?

KRISHNAMURTI: What is the importance of the future in our life? Why should it have any importance? What do we mean by the future? The tomorrow, the ideal, the everlasting hope of the Utopia, of what I should be, the pattern in different forms of an ideal society—is that what you mean by the future? We live by hope, and hope is a means of our death. When you hope, you are dead, because hope is an avoidance of the present. You do not hope when you are happy. It is only when you are unhappy, frustrated, restrained, when you are suffering, when you are aching, when you are a prisoner, that you look to the future. When you are really joyous, happy, time is not. We live with hope from birth to death because we are unhappy from the beginning to the very end; and hope is the way of escape, it is not the resolution of our actual state, which is unhappiness. We look to the future as a means of avoiding the present, and the man who avoids the present by going to the past or to the future, is not living; he does not know life as it is lived, he only knows life in relation to the past or to the future. Life is painful, tortuous, so we seek an escape from it; and if we are promised heaven, we are perfectly happy. That is why the party, whether of the left or the right, ultimately wins. The parties always promise something tomorrow, five years later, and we fall for it, we gobble it up; and we are ultimately destroyed. Because we want to escape from the present, if we cannot look to the future, we turn to the past—the past teachers, the past books, the knowledge of what has been said by Sankara, Buddha and others. So we either live in the past or in the future, and a man, in the past or in the future, is actually the responses of

for all such responses are mere reactions. It is therefore no good talking about the past and the future, about rewards and punishments. What is important is to find out how to live, how to be free from misery in the present. Virtue is not tomorrow. A man who is going to be merciful tomorrow is a foolish man. Virtue is not to be cultivated; it is in the understanding of what is in the present.

How are you to live in the present without the ache, the pain of sorrow? Sorrow is to be resolved, not in terms of time, but by understanding; it can be resolved only in the present—and that is why I don't talk about the future. There comes an extraordinary activity and vitality when there is a direct observation of what is; but you want to play with things, and when you play with serious things, you get burnt. You are swept away by hopes and rewards, and a man who pursues hope lives in death.

Our problem is whether sorrow can come to an end through the process of time, which is continuity. Sorrow cannot come to an end through time, because the process of time is continuance of suffering, and therefore no resolution of suffering. Sorrow can come to an end instantly; freedom is not at the end, but at the beginning. To understand this, there must be the beginning of freedom, the freedom to see the false as false, the capacity to see things as they are, not in time, but now. You do this when you are vitally interested, when you are in a crisis. After all, what is a crisis? It is a situation which demands your full attention without taking refuge in beliefs. When there is no solution, when there is no response of the mind, when the mind has no ready-made answer, no conclusion, and you are unable to resolve the problem—then you are in a crisis. But unfortunately, through your study of books and your following of teachers,

your mind has an explanation for every problem—therefore you are never in a moment of crisis. There is a challenge every minute, and a crisis comes when the mind has no ready-made answer. When you cannot find a way out, consciously or unconsciously, through words or through escapes, then you are in a crisis. Death is a crisis, though you can explain it away. You are in a crisis when you lose your money, when thousands are destroyed in a single second. Ending is the crisis—but you never end, you always want things to continue. It is only when there is a crisis without avoidance or escape and you are therefore confronted with it directly—it is only then that the problem is resolved. The concern with the future is the avoidance of the crisis; hope is avoidance of what is. To meet the crisis there must be complete denudation of the future and the past; therefore it is no good talking about the future.

Question : What should be the relationship, according to you, between the individual and the State?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do you want a blue print? Now you are back again at what should be. Speculation is the easiest and most wasteful thing that one can indulge in. Beware of the man who offers you hope, do not trust him, he will lead you to death; he is interested in his idea of the future, in his conception of what ought to be, and not in your life.

Are the State and the individual two different processes? Are they not interacting? How can you live without me, without another, and does not our relationship make society? You and I and another are a unitary process, we are not separate processes. The 'you' implies the 'me' and the other. You are the collective, not the single, though you would like to consider yourself single. You are the result of all the collec-

tive, and the individual can never be single. You have put a wrong question because you have divided the individual from the State. You are a result of the total process, of all the influences of the collective; and though the result can call itself individual, it is a product of the process which is going on. The understanding of this process is to be found in relationship, whether with the single or with the collective, and that understanding, and the action springing from it, will create a new society, a new order of things; but to paint a picture of what should be and to leave it to the reformers, the politicians, or the so-called revolutionaries, is merely to seek satisfaction in ideas. There can be fundamental revolution only when you meet the crisis directly without the intervention of the mind.

Question: You have talked about relationship based on usage of another for one's own gratification, and you have often hinted at a state called love. What do you mean by love?

KRISHNAMURTI: We know what our relationship is—a mutual gratification and use, though we clothe it by calling it love. In usage there is tenderness for and the safeguarding of what is used. We safeguard our frontier, our books, our property; similarly, we are careful in safeguarding our wives, our families, our society, because without them we would be lonely, lost. Without the child, the parent feels lonely; what you are not, the child will be, so the child becomes an instrument of your vanity. We know the relationship of need and usage. We need the postman and he needs us, yet we don't say we love the postman. But we do say that we love our wives and children, even though we use them for our personal gratification and are willing to sacrifice them for the vanity of being called patriotic. We know this process very well—and obviously, it cannot be love. Love

that uses, exploits, and then feels sorry, cannot be love, because love is not a thing of the mind.

Now, let us experiment and discover what love is—discover, not merely verbally, but by actually experiencing that state. When you use me as a *guru* and I use you as disciples, there is mutual exploitation. Similarly, when you use your wife and children for your furtherance, there is exploitation. Surely, that is not love. When there is use, there must be possession; possession invariably breeds fear, and with fear come jealousy, envy, suspicion. When there is usage, there cannot be love, for love is not something of the mind. To think about a person is not to love that person. You think about a person only when that person is not present, when he is dead, when he has run off, or when he does not give you what you want. Then your inward insufficiency sets the process of the mind going. When that person is close to you, you do not think of him; to think of him when he is close to you is to be disturbed, so you take him for granted—he is there. Habit is a means of forgetting and being at peace so that you won't be disturbed. So, usage must invariably lead to invulnerability, and that is not love.

What is that state when usage—which is thought process as a means to cover the inward insufficiency, positively or negatively—is not? What is that state when there is no sense of gratification? Seeking gratification is the very nature of the mind. Sex is sensation which is created, pictured by the mind; and then the mind acts or does not act. Sensation is a process of thought, which is not love. When the mind is dominant and the thought process is important, there is no love. This process of usage, thinking, imagining, holding, enclosing, rejecting, is all smoke; and when the smoke is not, the flame of love is. Sometimes we do have that flame, rich, full,

complete; but the smoke returns because we cannot live long with the flame, which has no sense of nearness, either of the one or the many, either personal or impersonal. Most of us have occasionally known the perfume of love and its vulnerability; but the smoke of usage, habit, jealousy, possession, the contract and the breaking of the contract—all these have become important for us, and therefore the flame of love is not. When the smoke is, the flame is not; but when we understand the truth of usage, the flame is. We use another because we are inwardly poor, insufficient, petty, small, lonely, and we hope that, by using another, we can escape. Similarly, we use God as a means of escape. The love of God is not the love of truth. You cannot love truth; loving truth is only a means of using it to gain something else that you know, and therefore there is always the personal

fear that you will lose something that you know.

You will know love when the mind is very still and free from its search for gratification and escapes. First, the mind must come entirely to an end. Mind is the result of thought, and thought is merely a passage, a means to an end. When life is merely a passage to something, how can there be love? Love comes into being when the mind is naturally quiet, not made quiet, when it sees the false as false and the true as true. When the mind is quiet, then whatever happens is the action of love, it is not the action of knowledge. Knowledge is mere experience, and experience is not love. Experience cannot know love. Love comes into being when we understand the total process of ourselves, and the understanding of ourselves is the beginning of wisdom.

February 5, 1950

I

TALK IN BOMBAY

Is it not important to find out how to listen? It seems to me that most of us do not listen at all. We listen through various screens of prejudice, examining what is being said, either as a Hindu, a Muslim, a Christian, or with a mind already made up. We do not listen freely, easily and silently. We listen with the intention to agree or to disagree, or we listen in a spirit of argumentation, we do not listen to find out; and it seems to me very important to know how to listen, how to read, to see, to observe. Most of us are incapable of listening truly, and it is only through right listening and hearing that we understand. Understanding comes, not through effort, not through any form of conformity or compulsion, but only when the mind is very quiet. In trying to find out what the other man is saying, there is no strain, no effort, but an easy flow, a swift delight; but we cannot find out what the other

man is saying if we listen with any kind of prejudice. Perhaps I may have something new to say, and it will be most difficult for those who are prejudiced, in favour or against, to really understand. Because most of us are conditioned by social, economic, religious influences, and so on; we are copyists, we imitate, and therefore we disregard that which is new, we call it revolutionary or absurd and put it aside. But if we can examine, if we can look at it with freedom from all prejudices, from all limitations, then perhaps it is possible to understand and to commune with each other. There is communion only when there is no barrier; and an idea, a prejudice, is a barrier. When you love somebody, you commune, you have no idea about the person whom you love. Similarly, if we can establish a relationship of real communion between us so that you and I understand the

problem together, then there is a possibility of a radical revolution in the world. After all, the world does need, not mere reformation, not a superficial revolution, but a fundamental, radical revolution, a revolution which is not based on an idea. Revolution that is the outcome of an idea is not a fundamental transformation, but merely the continuance of a modified idea or pattern. So, let us see if during these talks we can establish between the speaker and the listener a communion that is beyond mere words. Words are necessary for communication, but if we merely remain on that level, surely there is no understanding. Understanding comes when we go beyond the verbal level; but the highly cultivated mind lives on words, it is capable of examining only through the screen of words, and such examination is obviously not understanding; on the contrary, it merely leads to further arguments and disputations.

So, is it not possible for us to establish real communion, not merely on the verbal level, but at a deeper, more worthwhile level? Surely, that is possible; but to do it, you and I have to look at our problems anew—our problems being those of living, of relationship, of the strife between man and man, between groups of people—we have to approach and examine them afresh, for only then is there a possibility of bringing about a fundamental change in our lives and therefore in the life of society. Our first basic problem is one of relationship, is it not?; and that relationship is based on the morality of the past or of the future, that is, on traditional precepts, or on an idea of what ought to be. Our morality, upon which our action is based, is the outcome of the past, of the traditional, or of the future which is the ideal; and when we base our action on the future or on the past, obviously there is no action at all. As long as we live by hope we cannot act, because hope is obviously the

response of a future demand, and as long as we base our action on a hope, on an Utopia, on the ideal of perfection or a scheme of what ought to be, we are not living in the present. An idea is always of the future or of the past, and when relationship is considered in terms of the future or the past, naturally no action is possible—action being immediate, always in the present, in the now.

One of our enormous problems is, is it not?, to bring about a fundamental revolution in the present existing order. Seeing the disproportion and maldistribution, the whole economic structure of rich and poor, the conflict between those who have and those who have not, and so on, we try to solve the economic and social problems through a scheme, through an idea, through a pattern. There is the pattern, the system of the left and of the right, and these systems are invariably based on an idea. That is, the left starts out to resolve the problem by having a new system which is in conflict with the right; and as long as we are in conflict over ideas, on which all systems are based, obviously there is no solution. To put it differently, there are the problems of starvation, of unemployment, of wars, and we approach them, having already in mind a certain definite system for resolving each one of them. Can any system, whether of the left or of the right, resolve any problem? Both those who are committed to the left and those who are committed to the right consider that they have the perfect, the final, the absolute system, and so both approach the problem of starvation, of unemployment and wars, with an idea, with a prejudice. The result is that the systems, the ideas, the beliefs, are in conflict with each other, and the problems remain. If you and I really want to start resolving a problem, surely we must examine the problem directly without the prejudice or screen of a system; for it is only when the mind

is free from systems, whether of the left or of the right, that it is possible for us to face the problem itself.

Now, is it possible to have action without idea?—that is really the basic question. The idea is obviously a hope, it is based on the future or on the past; and can we live without hope? Obviously, to live without hope implies understanding the present directly, not in terms of the past or of the future. If we look into our own minds and examine the basis of our thought, we will see that we are thinking in terms of the ideal, of the future, of the hope of becoming something, of attaining a new state. Hope always leads to death, in hope there is no life; for life is in the present, not in the future. Life is neither in the future nor in the past, but in the process of living now. So, is it not possible to examine all our problems anew whatever they be—economic, individual or collective—to look at them without the pattern, the hope of the future, and without the prejudice, the conditioning of the past? Surely, every challenge is new, otherwise it is not a challenge; and to meet that challenge, our minds must be fresh, new, not burdened with the past or with the hope of the future. And is it possible for the mind to meet a problem without either the conditioning of the past, or the escape, the hope of the future? Surely, it is possible only when you and I, as individuals, are capable of understanding the problem, whatever it be, personal or collective, and responding to the challenge adequately, fully and completely; and it is only when the mind is not burdened with knowledge, with experience, that one can respond to the challenge adequately, naturally. That actually means, does it not?, that the mind must be capable of being very quiet; because it is only when we are not struggling, when we do not put forward an idea, when the mind is very quiet, that understanding comes. I do not know if you have noticed this

in your own daily life. When you are agitated, worrying over a problem, surely you do not understand it; but when the mind is very quiet, free from the past and the future, then it is capable of meeting the challenge adequately. It is the inadequacy of our response to the challenge that creates the problem, and our response to the challenge must be inadequate as long as our actions are based on either the past or the future, on either tradition or hope. Therefore, a man who would really understand the problem of existence and so bring about a radical revolution, must be free from the past and the future, from hope and from tradition, from the ideal and from what has been. Such a state of mind is creative, and it is only the creative mind that can understand the present problems, not the mind that is riddled with ideas, inventing schemes and following ideals, not the mind that is merely copying, imitating; because, the challenge is always new, and if we want to understand, we must meet it anew.

So, reality, or whatever name you like to give it, is a state of being in which the mind is no longer swinging between the past and the future, but is perceiving and understanding what is from moment to moment. The past and the future are not what is. The what is is the new, it is unrelated to the past and the future; and to meet it, the mind itself must not be caught in the swing of the past and the future, the mind must not be a passage, a movement of the past to the future. The understanding of what is is reality, and reality is not of time; and a mind that is the product of time cannot understand reality. So, the mind must be utterly still, not made still, not compelled, disciplined or controlled; and it is still only when it understands this whole process of becoming, this movement of time from the past through the present to the future.

Several questions have been sent in, and before I answer them, may I suggest that you and I together try to find the right answers. It is very easy to ask a question and wait for an answer, that is merely a schoolboy trick; but it requires a mature, an intelligent, exploring mind, a mind that is free from prejudices, to take the journey of discovery. So, in considering these questions, we are going to take a journey together and find the truth—not an answer to suit you or me. Truth, surely, is not opinion, truth is not dependent on knowledge; and where there is knowledge, truth is not. Truth is not the result of experience; for experience is memory, and merely to live in memory is to deny truth. To discover truth, the mind must be free, swift and pliable. Therefore, there must be that art of listening, of hearing, which reveals the truth without effort; because, effort is obviously desire, and where there is desire there is conflict, and conflict is never creative. So, in considering these questions, please do not wait for an answer because there is no answer. Life has no such answer as a 'yes' or a 'no', it is much too vast, immeasurable; and to fathom the immeasurable, the mind must be free, silent. Our quest is not to find an opinion, a conclusion with its admissions and denials, but to discover the right answer, the truth of the question. If I may suggest, you and I are going to see if we cannot discover the truth of the problem; because it is truth alone that frees you from the problem, not your or my opinion, however wise, however erudite. The man of knowledge, the man of opinion, the man of experience, will never find truth; for the mind must be very simple to find truth, and simplicity is not achieved through learning.

Question : Our lives are empty of any real impulse of kindness, and we seek to fill this void with organized

charity and compulsive justice. Sex is our life. Can you throw any light on this weary subject?

KRISHNAMURTI: To translate the question, our problem is, is it not?, that our lives are empty, and we know no love; we know sensations, we know advertising, we know sexual demands, but there is no love. And how is this emptiness to be transformed, how is one to find that flame without smoke? Surely, that is the question, is it not? So, let us find out the truth of the matter together.

Why are our lives empty? Though we are very active, though we write books and go to cinemas, though we play, love, and go to the office, yet our lives are empty, boring, mere routine. Why are our relationships so tawdry, empty, and without much significance? We know our own lives sufficiently well to be aware that our existence has very little meaning; we quote phrases and ideas which we have learnt—what so and so has said, what the mahatma, the latest saints or the ancient saints, have said. If it is not a religious, it is a political or intellectual leader that we follow, either Marx, or Adler, or Christ. We are just gramophone records repeating, and we call this repetition 'knowledge'. We learn, we repeat, and our lives remain utterly tawdry, boring and ugly. Why? Why is it like that? If you and I really put that question to ourselves, won't we find the answer? Why is it that we have given so much significance to the things of the mind? Why has the mind become so important in our lives—mind being ideas, thought, the capacity to rationalize, to weigh, to balance, to calculate? Why have we given such extraordinary significance to the mind?—which does not mean that we must become emotional, sentimental and gushy. We know this emptiness, we know this extraordinary sense of frustration; and why is there in lives this vast shallowness?"

of negation? Surely, we can understand it only when we approach it through awareness in relationship.

What is actually taking place in our relationships? Are not our relationships a self-isolation? Is not every activity of the mind a process of safeguarding, of seeking security, isolation? Is not that very thinking which we say is collective, a process of isolation? Is not every action of our life a self-enclosing process? You yourself can see it in your daily life, can't you? The family has become a self-isolating process; and being isolated, it must exist in opposition. So, all our actions are leading to self-isolation, which creates this sense of emptiness; and being empty, we proceed to fill the emptiness with radios, with noise, with chatter, with gossip, with reading, with the acquisition of knowledge, with respectability, money, social position, and so on and on. But these are all part of the isolating process, and therefore they merely give strength to isolation. So, for most of us, life is a process of isolation, of denial, resistance, conformity to a pattern; and naturally in that process there is no life, and therefore there is a sense of emptiness, a sense of frustration. Surely, to love someone is to be in communion with that person, not on one particular level, but completely, integrally, profusely; but we do not know such love. We know love only as sensation—my children, my wife, my property, my knowledge, my achievement; and that again is an isolating process, is it not? Our life in all directions leads to exclusion, it is a self-enclosing momentum of thought and feeling and occasionally we have communion with another. That is why there is this enormous problem.

Now, that is the actual state of our lives—respectability, possession, and emptiness—and the question is, how are we to go beyond it? How are we to go beyond this loneliness, this emptiness, this insufficiency, this

inner poverty? I do not think most of us want to. Most of us are satisfied as we are; it is too tiresome to find out a new thing, so we prefer to remain as we are—and that is the real difficulty. We have so many securities, we have built walls around ourselves with which we are satisfied; and occasionally there is a whisper beyond the wall, occasionally there is an earthquake, a revolution, a disturbance which we soon smother. So, most of us really do not want to go beyond the self-enclosing process; all that we are seeking is a substitution, the same thing in a different form. *Our dissatisfaction* is so superficial; we want a new thing that will satisfy us, a new safety, a new way of protecting ourselves—which is again the process of isolation. We are actually seeking, not to go beyond isolation, but to strengthen isolation so that it will be permanent and undisturbed. It is only the very few who want to break through and see what is beyond this thing that we call emptiness, loneliness. Those who are seeking a substitution for the old will be satisfied by discovering something that offers a new security; but there are obviously some who will want to go beyond that, so let us proceed with them.

Now, to go beyond loneliness, emptiness, one must understand the whole process of the mind, must one not? What is this thing we call loneliness, emptiness? How do we know it is empty, how do we know it is lonely? By what measure do you say it is 'this' and not 'that'? Do you understand the problem? When you say it is lonely, it is empty, what is the measure? How do you know it is empty? You can know it only according to the measurement of the old. You say it is empty, you give it a name, and you think you have understood it. Is not the very naming of the thing a hindrance to the understanding of it? Look, Sirs, most of us know what this loneliness

is, don't we ?, this loneliness from which we are trying to escape. Most of us are aware of this inner poverty, this inner insufficiency.. It is not an abortive reaction, it is a fact, and by calling it some name, we cannot dissolve it—it is there. Now, how do we know its content, how do we know the nature of it ? Do you know something by giving it a name ? Do you know me by calling me by a name ? You can know me only when you observe me, when you have communion with me ; but calling me by a name, saying I am this or that, obviously puts an end to communion with me. Similarly, to know the nature of that thing which we call loneliness, there must be communion with it ; and communion is not possible if you name it. To understand something, the naming must cease first. If you want to understand your child at all, which I doubt, what do you do ? You look at him, watch him in his play, observe him, study him, don't you ? In other words, you love that which you want to understand. When you love something, naturally there is communion with it ; but love is not a word, a name, a thought. You cannot love that which you call loneliness because you are not fully aware of it, you approach it with fear—not fear of it, but of something else. You have not thought about loneliness because you do not really know what it is. Sirs, don't smile, this is not a clever argument. Experience the thing while we are talking, then you will see the significance of it.

So, that thing which we call the empty is a process of isolation, which is the product of everyday relationship ; because, in relationship, we are consciously or unconsciously seeking exclusion. You want to be the exclusive owner of your property, of your wife or husband, of your children, you want to name the thing or the person as 'mine', which obviously means exclusive acquisition. This process of exclusion must

inevitably lead to a sense of isolation, and as nothing can live in isolation, there is conflict ; and from that conflict we are trying to escape. All forms of escape of which we can possibly conceive—whether social activities, drink, the pursuit of God, Puja, the performance of ceremonials, dancing and other amusements—are on the same level ; and if we see in daily life this total process of escape from conflict and want to go beyond it, we must understand relationship. It is only when the mind is not escaping in any form that it is possible to be in direct communion with that thing which we call loneliness, the alone ; and to have communion with that thing, there must be affection, there must be love. In other words, you must love the thing to understand it. Love is the only revolution ; and love is not a theory, not an idea, it does not follow any book or any pattern of social behaviour. So, the solution of the problem is not to be found in theories, which merely create further isolation ; it is to be found only when the mind, which is thought, is not seeking an escape from loneliness. Escape is a process of isolation, and the truth of the matter is that there can be communion only when there is love ; and it is only then that the problem of loneliness is resolved.

Question : India has an ancient tradition of simple living and few wants. At present, however, millions are held in the grip of involuntary poverty and privation, while at the other end of the scale this land is dominated by the rich upper classes who are already living a European mode of life. How can one discover the right relationship to possessions and comforts ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Sir, what do you mean by simplicity ? Is it not important to find out first what is simplicity of life ? Having but few

clothes, a couple of loin cloths—is that a simple life? Is it a simple life to have few needs and be satisfied with one meal a day? The outward show of simplicity—is that simple? Or must simplicity begin at quite a different level, not at the periphery, but at the centre? So, let us find out what we mean by simplicity.

A mind that is complex, struggling to develop virtues, seeking power by trying to follow an ideal, to be non-violent, disciplining itself, conforming to something, aiming at something, forcing itself in order to become something—is such a mind simple? Obviously not. But we want the outward show of simplicity, because that is very profitable; that is the traditional, the ideal. A mind that pursues the ideal is not a simple mind—it is an escaping mind. A mind in conflict, a mind that is conforming to a pattern, whatever it be, is not a simple mind; but where there is simplicity at the centre, there will be simplicity also at the periphery.

Now, the questioner wants to know how to discover the right relationship to possessions and comforts. If we use possessions for psychological gratification, then obviously possessions lead to complexity. We use things, possessions, not as mere necessities, but to satisfy a psychological need, do we not? That is, property becomes a means of self-aggrandizement. Most of us are seeking titles, position, property, land, virtues, recognition; and all that implies, does it not?, a psychological need, an inward demand to be something. When our relationship to property is based on a psychological need, obviously we cannot lead a simple life, and therefore there must be conflict—which is so clear. That is, when I use property, people, or ideas as a means towards my psychological gratification, then I must possess—whatever it is, it is 'mine'. Therefore, I must

protect it, I must fight for it, and hence the conflict begins.

So, it is important, is it not?, to understand our relationship to property; but obviously, you cannot understand that relationship if you approach it through any particular pattern. Understanding is not according to any plan, whether communist or socialist, whether of the right or of the left. As long as we use property as a means of self-aggrandizement, there must be conflict, there must be a society which is based on violence. It is not merely an economic problem, but much more a psychological problem; and the economists who are trying to solve it on the economic level will always fail because the significance is much deeper. Aren't you using property, comforts, power, as a means of self-aggrandizement? To know that you have so much money in the bank, that you have a title, an estate—does it not give you importance, a sense of power? If it is not property you are after, then you want to be an official, a bureaucrat, a commissar, an ambassador, and God knows what else; and from that you get a sense of satisfaction, the feeling that you are somebody.

So, we base our relationship on self-aggrandizement; and as long as we use people, ideas and things for our self-aggrandizement, there must be violence. The problem cannot be solved through any pattern of economic or social action, but requires the understanding of our whole psychological being; therefore there must be an inward revolution, and not merely a revolution on the outside. It is very difficult to be as nothing, not to demand to be something, because most of us want to be successful, we are all after success in some form or other, are we not? In the business or social world, in politics, as a writer, as a poet, we want recognition, we want success in some form; so the problem is really much more inward and psychologi-

cal than outward and objective.' As long as we base our relationship on property, there must be this appalling division of those who have and those who have not, the rich and the poor; and we are trying to abolish that division through revolution based on an idea, which is a pattern of outside action determining how individuals shall behave in society without a fundamental, radical transformation at the centre, which is the psyche. That is why a revolution which merely substitutes one pattern for another is no revolution at all. We think that by having an outward revolution we can bring about a new world based on what should be. On the contrary, revolution can only be at the centre, in the psyche, and then it will produce real outward revolution; but do what you will, mere outward revolution can never bring about an internal revolution.

So, our problem is, not how to bring about a new pattern or a new substitution, but how to awaken the radical revolution in ourselves. That is the real problem; because, what you are, the world is. Your problem is the world's problem, you are not separate from the world; you and the world are an integrated process, the world is not without you. So, unless there is a revolution at the centre, revolution on the outside has very little meaning. Most of us do not want to change, or we want to change only superficially while maintaining certain things as they are in relation to our psychological demands; but it is only a radical inward revolution that will transform the world. It must begin with you as an individual, you cannot look to the mass; for it is only individuals, not the mass, that can bring about transformation. Therefore, you and I must radically transform ourselves, and in that there is tremendous beauty, in that there is creative thinking. A man who is happy, who loves, does not want possessions, he

is not carried away by success, by power, position or authority. It is the unhappy, the sorrowful, who seek power and success as an escape from their own insufficiency. Superficial discontent only leads to gratification and further discontent; and as most of us are only superficially discontented, we do not want to be free from discontent. To be free from discontent is to bring about a fundamental revolution. Contentment, which is not the opposite of discontent, is that state in which there is the understanding of what is; and the understanding of what is is not a matter of time, it is not in the movement of the past to the future. The mind can be free only when it is simple, clean, and such a mind alone can be content. Only the mind that is free can establish right relationship to property. You will say, 'That will take a very long time, because it is only a few who can do it. In the meantime, the world is going to pieces, and therefore we must organize collectively'. That is a very facile and specious argument. Actually, even though you organize yourselves to bring about a collective revolution, that also will take time; and how do you know that you have the key to the future? What gives you the authority and the certainty that by your particular revolution you are going to create a marvellous Utopia?

Surely, then, it is really important that the problem be viewed, not on a particular level, but profoundly, intimately, and with an integrated approach, for in that alone is there a solution. You cannot be integrated if you approach the problem with any sense of resistance, through any form of compulsion or conformity. Therefore, the thing that brings about integration is love; but to love the problem, you cannot impose on it any particular theory or discipline. If you really want to solve this problem of right relationship to property, you must be able to understand the whole

structure of your being. But you see, you want quick answers, you want an immediate response, an easy solution to this problem; and no one on earth can give it to you. There is no immediate solution to a very complex problem. The immediacy is in the response of the individual, not in the solution of the problem. You can change immediately if you so desire—but you don't. It is when you have a crisis that you have to change. A crisis means that you approach the problem with extraordinary completeness, otherwise it is not a crisis. But you do not want crises in your lives; that is why you have lawyers, that is why you have priests, that is why you have official revolutionaries. You avoid crisis; but when you are up against it, then you will find the right answer.

Question: What is self-knowledge? The traditional approach to self-knowledge is the knowledge of Atman as distinct from the ego. Is that what you mean by self-knowledge?

KRISHNAMURTI: Look, Sirs, you are all well-read, aren't you? You have read all the religious books, and that is how you know about the Atman; otherwise you do not know anything about it. You have read it in the books and you like the idea, so you accept it; but you don't really know whether it exists or does not exist. You want permanency, and the Atman guarantees it. Now, suppose you had not read a single religious book about the Atman, the Super-Atman, and all the rest of it, what would you do? You might invent; but if you had no previous knowledge, what would be your approach? And that is my approach—I have not read a single religious or psychological book, because I do not want them. Not that I am conceited; but since the whole business is inside you, you can discover it for yourself—but not by looking outside.

Otherwise, how do you know that Sankaracharya, Buddha, or the very latest authority, is not wrong?

So, to discover truth, there must be freedom; freedom, not at the end, but at the very beginning. Freedom is not at the end, liberation is not an end-product; it must be at the beginning, otherwise you cannot discover. Therefore, there must be freedom, freedom from the past—and that is what you and I are going to find out. You want to know what is self-knowledge. It is not of the ego, not of the Atman—you do not know what that means. All that you know is that you are here, an entity in relationship with another, with your wife and children, with the world—that is all you know. That is the actual fact. Whether the Atman exists or not is merely a theory, a speculation, and speculation is a waste of time; it is for the sluggish, the thoughtless.

Now, what am I? That is all that matters: what am I? I am going to find out what I am; I am going to see how far I can go in that direction and find out where it leads. Because, that is the fact—not the Atman, not the ego, not the super-super-super. I do not think about those things, even though Buddha and Christ and everybody may have talked about them. What I can know is my relationship with property, with people, with ideas. So, the beginning of self-knowledge lies in the understanding of relationship, and that relationship plays on all levels, not on one particular level only. I have to find out what my relationship is with my wife, with my children, with property, with society, with ideas. Relationship is the mirror in which I see myself as I am, and to see myself as I am is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom is not something that you can buy in books or go to a guru to acquire; that is mere information, and wisdom is not information. Wisdom is the beginning of self-knowledge, and that

wisdom comes when you understand relationship.

Now, to understand relationship, to see very clearly in relationship the fact of what you are, there must be no condemnation or justification—you must look at the fact with freedom. How can you understand something if you condemn it, or wish it to be something other than it is? Through your understanding of relationship there comes the discovery from minute to minute of the ways of your thinking, the structure of your mind; and as long as the mind does not understand its total process, both the conscious and the unconscious, there can be no freedom. So, through the relationship of everyday contacts, of everyday action, you come to a point when you see that the thinker is not different from thought. When you say the Atman is different from the ego, it is still within the field of thought; and without understanding the process, the functioning of thought, it is utterly futile to talk of reality and the Atman, because they have no existence, they are merely the prejudices of thought. What we have to do is to understand the thought process, and that can be understood only in relationship. Self-knowledge begins with the understanding of relationship—which we shall discuss later.

Then there is the question of the thinker and the thought, the experiencer and the experienced, with which we are familiar. Is there a thinker as an entity separate from thought? Surely there is no separate entity; there is only thought, and it is thought that has created this separate entity called the thinker. Thought is the response of memory, both the conscious as well as the unconscious, the bidden and the open; memory is experience, and experience is response to a challenge, which becomes the experienced—that is the total process of our consciousness, is it not? There is memory, then ex-

perience, which is the response to challenge, then the naming process, which further cultivates memory. Memory responds as thought in relationship, and this whole process of thought, this cycle of memory, challenge, response, experience and naming, which becomes further memory, is what we call consciousness. That is all I am, that is all I know. So, I see that my mind functions within the field of time, within the field of the known; and can it function beyond that field? I see now the whole process of my thinking, which leads me to the question, can the mind go beyond thought, which is the result of the known? Obviously not; because, when thought seeks to go beyond, it is pursuing its own projection. Thought cannot experience the unknown, it can only experience that which it has projected, which is the known. Thought is the mind, which is the result of time, the result of the past; and I want to know if the mind can go beyond itself. Obviously it cannot, because the 'beyond' is the unknown, it is not of time. So, the mind must come to an end—which means, the mind must be still, meditative. Meditation is not the becoming of something, but the understanding of the total process of relationship, which is self-knowledge. It is only when the mind is still, not compelled to be still, that there is a possibility of experiencing the unknown.

So, then, can the mind, which is the result of experience, which is memory—can such a mind experience the unknown? Do you understand the problem? Can the mind, which is memory, the product of time, experience the timeless? Is the function of the mind to remember; and is truth a matter of experience and remembrance? Discuss all this further along; but just listen: said, go with it, play with it, resist it. The past is the result of

mory, and memory says, 'I have experienced or have not experienced'. Is truth, the unknown, the immeasurable, a matter of experience, which means something to be remembered? If you remember something, it is already the known, is it not? So, is it not possible to experience something which is not in terms of time—which means experiencing in the sense of seeing the truth from moment to moment? If I remember truth, it is no longer truth; because memory is a matter of time, of continuity, and truth is not of time, truth is not a continuity. The truth of the Buddha is not the truth which you discover today. Truth is never the same, it has no continuity; it is only from moment to moment, it cannot be remembered. There is truth only when mind is completely silent. Truth is not something to be sought after, experienced, held and worshipped. There can be the experiencing of the timeless only when the mind is free from all conditioning. So, self-knowledge is the understanding of conditioning.

What is important is to understand the total process of the mind. We will discuss it later; but we will have to see that truth is not something to be remembered. That which is remembered is of time, it is a thing of the past, and truth can never be of the past or of the future; truth can only be in the present, in that state where there is no time. Time is the process of the mind, the mind is thought, and thought is the response of memory. Memory is the experience of challenge and response, and because the response is inadequate it creates the problem in relationship. So, the understanding of the total process of the self lies in the understanding of relationship in daily life; and that understanding frees the mind from time, and therefore it is capable of experiencing reality from moment to moment, "is not a process of remember-

ing—it can no longer be termed 'experience', it is quite a different state altogether. That state of being is bliss, it is not something that you learn in books and repeat like gramophone records. Such a man is happy, he does not repeat, for him life has no problem. It is only the mind that creates problems.

February 12, 1950

II

TALK IN BOMBAY

When there is so much confusion and contradiction, not only in our own lives, but also among the specialists and the learned, action becomes extremely difficult, and to know what to do, to find a right mode of conduct, a right way of living, is hazardous and uncertain. This confusion is on the increase at the present time, not only in ourselves, but also about us; and we have to find, have we not?, a way of action that will not bring more conflict, more misery, more strife and destruction. We see that whatever the experts, the political leaders and religious authorities assert, only leads to further misery, further chaos, further confusion. So, the problem of action—not only individual, but also collective action—is very important; and to find out how to live is much more significant than merely to follow a certain pattern of action.

Now, to act, obviously there must be true individuality; but, though we have separate bodies, we are actually not individuals at all, psychologically we are not separate. We are not individuals in the true sense of the word, but are made up of many layers of memory, of tradition, conflict, and patterns, both conscious and otherwise; and that is the whole structure of our being. So, if we examine the individual closely, we will see that in actuality there is no

individuality at all, there is no uniqueness. After all, by individuality we mean the quality of uniqueness, the quality of creativeness, the quality of aloneness that is creative. Sirs, the action which does not contribute to further misery, to further chaos, to further destruction, is possible only when there is true individuality, and individuality is possible only when we understand this whole process of conformity and imitation. For most of us, living is merely the pursuit of a pattern, the pattern that has been, or the pattern that will be. If we examine our daily conduct, our daily way of thinking, we will see that the process of our action is a continual imitation, a mere copying. All that we know and all that we have acquired is based on imitation. It is because we are imitative, copying, that we are not individuals at all. We quote what so and so has said, what Sankaracharya, Buddha or Christ has said, because it has become the pattern of our existence never to discover, never to find out the truth for ourselves, but to repeat what someone else has discovered, what someone else has experienced. When we use the experience of another, however true, as the pattern for our action, our action then is really founded on imitation, and that action is a lie. Please sit down, Sir—these meetings are not meant for those who are not serious. This is not a political meeting or a show, where you can show off your faces or get your photographs taken. (Laughter) You would not do this in a religious temple, would you? We are dealing with life, not with the mere outward show of things; and to understand life, we have to understand this complete process of living which is ourselves. To understand ourselves we must understand the whole content of the conscious and of the unconscious mind; and if you merely pay scant attention to what

is being said, I am afraid you will not gather the full significance of it.

So, action which is based on imitation, on copying, on conformity, on the pursuit of a pattern, must inevitably lead to confusion—which is actually what is happening in the world at the present time. Why is it that we conform, why is it that we imitate, copy, quote authorities, cling to the sanction of what has been or what will be? Why is it that we cannot discover how to live directly for ourselves, instead of copying somebody? Is it not because most of us are afraid to be without security? Most of us want a certain state which we call ‘peace’, but which is really a state in which one does not want to be disturbed. Most of us are not adventurous, and that is why we merely live by copying and are satisfied with imitation. It is only when we break through, when we understand the processs of imitation, that there is a possibility of individual action, which is creation.

Especially in these times, when there is so much confusion in the world, when there are so many authorities, so many gurus, so many leaders, each asserting and denying, each giving a new pattern of action, is it not important to find out what is action independent of the pattern, independent of the copy? And you can find that out only when you understand the process and the significance of imitation—not only the imitation of an external example, but the imitation and the conformity brought about by the authority of your own experience. Authority comes into being, does it not?, when you want to be secure; and the more you desire security, the less you will have it—which is being shown by these endless wars. Each group consisting of so-called individuals wants to be secure, so each creates a system, a pattern for security based on its own authority in conflict with the authority of others. So, as long

as you seek security in any form, psychological or physiological, there must be conflict, there must be destruction. The desire for security implies conformity; and it is only when the mind is really insecure, completely uncertain, when it has no authority, either external or inward, when it is not imitating an example, an ideal, or clinging to the authority of what has been—it is only then that the mind is without any conformity and therefore free to discover; and only then is there creation.

So, our problem is not how to act, but how to bring about that state of creation which is true individuality. That state is obviously not based on an idea, because creation can never be an ideation. Ideation must cease for the creative to be. There cannot be creative action as long as there is a pattern, an idea; and as our life is based on idea, on conformity to the ideal, we are not creative—and that is the real problem, and not how to act. Anybody will tell you how to act, any politician, any clever system, will tell you what to do; but in doing it, you will create more mischief, more misery, more confusion, more strife, because your action is not the outcome of creation. That is why it is important to be free from conformity and to be a true individual. To do that, you must know what you are at every moment; and in the understanding of what you are, there is a possibility of bringing about a society which is not based on conflict, destruction and misery. Such an individual is a happy individual, and happiness does not demand the imitation of virtue; on the contrary, happiness creates virtue. A happy man is a virtuous man—it is the unhappy man who is not virtuous; and however much he may try to become virtuous, as long as he is unhappy, for him there is no virtue. He may become respectable, but respectability only covers up unhappiness. So, what is important is

to discover for ourselves the pattern of conformity and to see the truth about that conformity; for only when we see that the pattern is created by fear of insecurity can there be a state of creation.

I have as usual been given many questions, and while considering them together may I suggest that you do not resist what is being said, but rather hear it just as you would listen to music. Just listen to me without disputation. To dispute and deny is the usual and easy way, but the disputatious mind can never be in a state of tranquillity, in which alone understanding comes. Also, if I may suggest, do not merely wait for explanations, do not look to me for a conclusion or an answer—which I shall not give. There is no categorical answer for the real problems of life, there is only understanding; and understanding is catching the full significance of the problem, seeing the whole content of it. So, please be good enough to listen to me with friendliness, and with the intention to find out the significance of the problem itself rather than merely wait for an answer.

Question : You assert that you have not read a single book, but do you really mean it? Don't you know that such loose statements cause resentment? You appear to know the latest jargon of politics, economics, psychology, and the sciences; and are you trying to suggest that you get all this information by some superhuman powers?

KRISHNAMURTI : Sir, whether you like it or not, it is a fact that I have not read a single religious book, nor any books on psychology or science; and it is also a fact that when I was young I was not put through a rigorous course of learning in philosophy or psychology. Somehow or other I have been reluctant to read them—they bore me, that is a fact.

Obviously I meet large numbers of people of every type—scientists, philosophers, analysts, religious people, and so on—who come to discuss; and occasionally I read some weekly magazines on politics and world affairs. That is all I have in the way of general information. Now, why do you resent it? Is it not because you have read so much, and your own ignorance is shown up by someone who has not read? Sir, do you read in order to become wise? Is knowledge wisdom? Is wisdom not something entirely different from knowledge? But there are two problems in this: one is why there is resentment in you, and the other is how I gather all that I am talking about. So, let us first enquire into why you resent.

Is it not important to find out why you feel resentment? You read newspapers, magazines, sacred books, all the commentaries on philosophy, psychology and science, and you keep on reading. Why do you read, why do you keep your mind so constantly occupied? And why do you resent it when somebody who has not read points out something? Is it because you are frustrated and you dislike, you hate anyone who shows a different attitude towards life? What is the process of your own resentment? Surely it is important to find out whether wisdom, understanding, comes through books; and why is it that you read, why do you fill your minds with information, with what so and so has said? Does it not indicate a very sluggish mind, an unenquiring mind? Does it not also indicate a mind that is not capable of really investigating, directly experiencing? Such a mind is living on other people's experience, and so it is satisfied, it is put to sleep, it is made dull; and can a mind that is filled with chatter, with information, ever be receptive to wisdom?

The second problem is this: though I may talk, I have not read any book; and you ask, "Are you trying to sug-

gest that you get all this information by some superhuman powers?" Now, if you do not read, you have to know how to listen, you have to see and understand more clearly, observe more delicately and acutely, do you not? You have to be much more subtly aware of everything about you, not only of the people you meet, the people who come to see you, but also of the people in the tramcar, in the taxi, on the road. You have to watch everything, haven't you?, more acutely, more clearly; and you are prevented from doing it, if you are cluttered up with information. When you are living fully, with undivided attention, there is direct experience, you do not have authorities and sanctions; and besides, why do you want to look to others when you have the whole treasure in yourself? After all, you are the total result of all humanity, are you not?, both the collective and the so-called individual. You are the sum total of all the fathers and all the mothers; and if you know how to look into yourself, you do not have to read a single book on religion, on philosophy or psychology, because the book is yourself. You may have to read for scientific information, to learn mathematics, and so on; but all that can be kept in libraries. Why do you want to fill your mind with facts when you have a treasure in yourself which requires a great deal of attention, a great deal of watchfulness? You see, that is the whole gist of the matter. Though we come across people of every type, of every degree of learning, it is the understanding of oneself that brings infinite knowledge, infinite wisdom.

Sirs, I am sure that in the olden days, before books were published, before there were followers, teachers and gurus, there were original discoverers who had never read any book. Because there was no *Bhagavad Gita*, no *Bible*, no book of any kind, they had to find out for themselves, had they not? How did they go

about it? Obviously they neither had sanctions, nor did they stupidly quote the authority of some individual. They searched out the truth for themselves, they found it in the sacred places of their own minds and hearts. Surely we also can discover the truth for ourselves in the sacred places of our minds and hearts. But to discover, to see what is without condemnation or justification, is extraordinarily difficult. The mind is merely a process of the past using the present as a passage to the future; and how can such a mind see what is? To see what is, the mind must be free from all acquisition, from all accumulation—but that is a different problem. We are now trying to understand the problem of why we read, and why we have resentment against those who do not read; and is it possible for one who has read, who has accumulated so much information, to be free to see, to listen and to hear?

Now, it is no good being resentful, that is stupid, that is only a waste of time; but we are all indulging in action which has no meaning, and surely, Sirs and Ladies, if you want to find out what wisdom is, you have in yourselves the key and also the door which must be opened. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom; but self-knowledge begins very near, it is not at some supreme Atmic level—which is merely another invention of a clever mind seeking security. Self-knowledge is reflected in your relationship with your wife, with your children, with your neighbour, with your boss, with your property, with the trees, and with the world. To go very far, you must begin very near. But most of us dislike to begin near because we are so ugly and so frightened of ourselves; so we imagine something marvellous in the distance and make that our goal, our motto, the pattern which we have to follow. Because we are not willing to see and understand what we are from moment to

moment, we make of our life a contradiction, a misery, an utter mess. Sir, truth is here, not far; happiness is in the discovery of what is, and that is virtue.

Question : Is beauty to be cultivated or acquired? What does beauty mean to you?

KRISHNAMURTI: Beauty, surely, is something which is not of the mind, therefore beauty is not sensation. Most of us seek sensation, which we call beauty. The fashion, the style which can be changed, adjusted or dropped; the expensive furniture which you buy or have copied for your particular home, if you have money; the beautiful woman, the beautiful child, the beautiful picture, the beautiful house—surely, all that is really the response of sensation, which is the response of the mind, is it not? And is beauty sensation, is beauty merely of external form and shape? Putting on a saree in the right way, having one's lips carefully curved by lipstick, walking in a particular manner—is that beauty? And is beauty the denial of the ugly? Is virtue the denial of evil? Is there beauty in any denial? Surely, there is denial, the pleasing and the not-pleasing, only when there is sensation. Just listen to it, do not contradict, do not oppose; just listen and you will discover what we mean by beauty.

While the outward form must obviously be given certain respect and needs certain care, cleanliness, and all the rest of it, both as part of necessity and for esthetic reasons, surely that is not beauty, is it? Beauty which is a sensation is of the mind, and the mind can make anything beautiful or ugly; therefore beauty that depends on the mind is not beauty, is it? So, what is beauty? The mind is sensation, and if the mind judges beauty and gives it a name as goodness or truth, is that

beauty? If beauty is perceived through the mind, it is sensation, and sensation comes to an end; and can that ever be beautiful? Do you understand what I mean? Is it beauty that comes to an end as sensation? I see a tree in the evening lights, the sun dancing and sparkling on the palm leaves, and it is very beautiful. The mind, becoming attached to it, says, 'How beautiful it is', and holds to it, resuscitating and reviving that image. At the moment of perception it has great pleasure, a deep sense of satisfaction, which it calls the beautiful, but a second later it is over, it is only a memory; so the mind gives continuity to the sensation of what it calls beauty.

The mind, then, is continually picturing, imagining the beautiful, which is always of the past. But is beauty of time? If it is not of time, then beauty is something illimitable, is it not? ; it is not within the frame of the word 'beauty'. The mind can invent the beautiful, but the experience of the illimitable cannot be known by a mind that is pursuing the sensation of beauty. You and I can see beauty externally; but the mere appreciation of that expression is not beauty, is it? So, beauty is something beyond the mind, beyond sensation, beyond time-limits, beyond the time-binding quality of thought; and that measureless sense, in which all things are, is beauty—which is to be really infinitely sensitive. The man who denies evil, who denies the ugly, can never know what beauty is, because the very denial is the cultivation of the ugly. The illimitable is not to be found in a dictionary, in any religious or philosophical book.

So, beauty is not something of the mind; but unfortunately, modern civilization is making beauty a thing of the mind. All the picture magazines, all the cinemas, are doing it; most of our efforts go to making wonderful paintings, marvellous

furniture, building beautiful houses, buying the most fashionable dresses, the latest lipstick, or whatever is displayed in the advertisements. We are caught in the things of the mind, and that is why our lives are so ugly, so empty, that is why we decorate ourselves—which does not mean that we should not decorate ourselves. But there is an inner beauty, and when you see it, then it gives significance to the outer; but merely decorating the outer while ignoring the inner is just like beating a drum—it is still empty. Beauty is a thing beyond the mind; and to find that which is beautiful—call it truth, God, or what you will—, there must be freedom from the thought process. But that is another problem which we can discuss some other time.

Question: Through such movements as the United Nations Organization and the World Pacifist Conferences recently held in India, men all over the world are making an individual and collective effort to prevent the third world war. How does your attempt differ from theirs, and do you hope to have any appreciable results? Can the impending war be prevented?

KRISHNAMURTI: Let us first dispose of the obvious facts, and then go more deeply into the matter. The first fact is the impending war; and can we prevent it? Sir, what do you think? Men are bent on slaughtering each other; you are bent on slaughtering your neighbour—not with swords, perhaps, but you are exploiting them, aren't you?, politically, religiously, and economically. There are social, communal, lingual divisions, and are you not making a great ado about all this? You do not want to prevent the impending war because some of you are going to make money. (Laughter.) The cunning are going to make money, and the stupid also will want to make

more. For God's sake, see the ugliness, the ruthlessness of it. Sir, when you have a set purpose of gain at all costs, the result is inevitable, is it not ? The third world war is arising from the second world war, the second world war arose from the first, and the first was the result of previous wars. Until you put an end to the cause, mere tinkering with the symptoms has no significance. One of the causes of war is nationalism, sovereign governments and all the ugliness that goes with them—power, prestige, position and authority. Most of us do not want to put an end to war because our lives are incomplete; our whole existence is a battlefield, a ceaseless conflict, not only with one's wife, one's husband, one's neighbour, but with ourselves—the constant struggle to become something. That is our life, of which war and the hydrogen bomb are merely the violent and spectacular projections; and as long as we do not understand the whole significance of our existence and bring about a radical transformation, there can be no peace in the world.

Now, the second problem is much more difficult, much more demanding of your attention—which does not mean that the first one is not important. It is that most of us pay scant attention to the transformation of ourselves because we do not want to be transformed. We are contented and do not want to be disturbed. We are satisfied to go along as we are, and that is why we are sending our children to war, why we must have military training. You all want to save your bank accounts, hold on to your property—all in the name of non-violence, in the name of God and peace, which is a lot of sanctimonious nonsense. What do we mean by peace ? You say the U.N.O. is trying to establish peace by organizing its member nations, which means it is balancing power. Is that a pursuit of peace ?

Then there is the gathering of

individuals around a certain idea of what they consider to be peace. That is, the individual resists war either according to his moral persuasion, or his economic ideas. We place peace either on a rational basis, or on a moral basis. We say we must have peace because war is not profitable, which is the economic reason ; or we say we must have peace because it is immoral to kill, it is irreligious, man is Godly in his nature and must not be destroyed, and so on. So, there are all these various explanations of why we should not have war : the religious, moral, humanitarian, or ethical reasons for peace on the one hand, and the rational, economic, or social reasons on the other.

Now, is peace a thing of the mind ? If you have a reason, a motive for peace, will that bring about peace ? Do you understand what I mean ? If I refrain from killing you because I think it is immoral, is that peaceful ? If for economic reasons I do not destroy, if I do not join the army because I think it is unprofitable, is that peaceful ? If I base my peace on a motive, on a reason, can that bring about peace ? If I love you because you are beautiful, because you please me bodily, is that love ? Sirs, please pay a little attention to it, because it is very important. Most of us have so cultivated our minds, we are so intellectual, that we want to find reasons for not killing, the reasons being the appalling destructiveness of the atomic bomb, the moral and economic arguments for peace, and so on ; and we think that the more reasons we have for not killing, the more there will be peace. But can you have peace through a reason, can peace be made into a cause ? Is not the very cause part of the conflict ? Is non-violence, is peace an ideal to be pursued and attained eventually through a gradual process of evolution ? These are all reasons, rationalizations, are they not ? So, if we are at all thoughtful,

our question really is, is it not ?, whether peace is a result, the outcome of a cause, or whether peace is a state of being, not in the future or in the past, but now. If peace, if non-violence is an ideal, surely it indicates that actually you are violent, you are not peaceful. You wish to be peaceful, and you give reasons why you should be peaceful; and being satisfied with the reasons, you remain violent. Actually, a man who wants peace, who sees the necessity of being peaceful, has no ideal about peace. He does not make an effort to become peaceful, but sees the necessity, the truth of being peaceful. It is only the man who does not see the importance, the necessity, the truth of being peaceful, who makes non-violence an ideal—which is really only a postponement of peace. And that is what you are doing: you are all worshipping the ideal of peace, and in the meantime enjoying violence. (Laughter.) Sirs, you laugh; you are easily amused, aren't you? It is another entertainment; and when you leave this meeting, you will go on exactly as before. Do you expect to have peace by your facile arguments, your casual talk? You will not have peace because you do not want peace, you are not interested in it, you do not see the importance, the necessity of having peace now, not tomorrow. It is only when you have no reason for being peaceful that you will have peace.

Sirs, as long as you have a reason to live, you are not living, are you? You live only when there is no reason, no cause—you just live. Similarly, as long as you have a reason for peace, you will have no peace. A mind that invents a reason for being peaceful is in conflict, and such a mind will produce chaos and conflict in the world. Just think it out and you will see. How can the mind that invents reasons for peace, be peaceful? You can have very clever arguments and counter-argu-

ments; but is not the very structure of the mind based on violence? The mind is the outcome of time, of yesterday, and it is always in conflict with the present; but the man who really wants to be peaceful now, has no reason for it. For the peaceful man, there is no motive for peace. Sir, has generosity a motive? When you are generous with a motive, is that generosity? When a man renounces the world in order to achieve God, in order to find something greater, is that renunciation? If I give up this in order to find that, have I really given up anything? If I am peaceful for various reasons, have I found peace?

So, then, is not peace a thing far beyond the mind and the inventions of the mind? Most of us, most religious people with their organizations, come to peace through reason, through discipline, through conformity, because there is no direct perception of the necessity, the truth of being peaceful. Peacefulness, that state of peace, is not stagnation; on the contrary, it is a most active state. But the mind can only know the activity of its own creation, which is thought; and thought can never be peaceful, thought is sorrow, thought is conflict. As we know only sorrow and misery, we try to find ways and means to go beyond it; and whatever the mind invents only further increases its own misery, its own conflict, its own strife. You will say that very few will understand this, that very few will ever be peaceful in the right sense of the word. Why do you say that? Is it not because it is a convenient escape for you? You say that peace can never be achieved in the way I am talking about, it is impossible; therefore you must have reasons for peace, you must have organizations for peace, you must have clever propaganda for peace. But all those methods are obviously mere postponement of peace. Only when you are directly in touch with the problem, when you

see that without peace today you cannot have peace tomorrow, when you have no reason for peace but actually see the truth that without peace life is not possible, creation is not possible, that without peace there can be no sense of happiness—only when you see the truth of that, will you have peace. Then you will have peace without any organizations for peace. Sir, for that you must be so vulnerable, you must demand peace with all your heart, you must find the truth of it for yourself, not through organizations, through propaganda, through clever arguments for peace and against war. Peace is not the denial of war. Peace is a state of being in which all conflicts and all problems have ceased; it is not a theory, not an ideal to be achieved after ten incarnations, ten years or ten days. As long as the mind has not understood its own activity, it will create more misery; and the understanding of the mind is the beginning of peace.

Question : You repeat again and again that the mind must cease for reality to come into existence. Why then do you attack prayer, worship and ceremonials, which are really meant to still the mind ?

KRISHNAMURTI : By a trick the mind can be made quiet; you can take a drug or a drink, you can do ceremonial, worship, pray. There are many means by which you can make the mind still. But is the mind still when it is made still? Some of you pray, don't you? You repeat the Gayatri, you chant to still the mind, or you clasp your hands and mesmerize yourself into a state which you call peace. Self-hypnosis by the repetition of words is very simple. When you keep on repeating certain words, your mind becomes very still, quiet; by taking certain postures, breathing a certain way, forcing the mind, you can obviously reduce the

activity of the mind. That is, through various tricks of discipline, compulsion, conformity, the mind is made still; but when the mind is made still, is it really still? It is dead, is it not? It is in a state of hypnosis. When you pray you repeat certain phrases, and that quietens the mind; and in that quietness there are certain responses, you hear voices which you of course attribute to the Highest. That 'Highest' always replies to your most urgent demand, and the reply gives you gratification. This is all a well-known psychological process. But when the mind is made still through prayer, through ceremonials, through repetition, through chanting, through songs, is the mind really still, or merely dull? The mind has hypnotized itself into quietness, has it not? And most of you enjoy that hypnotized state, because in that state you have no problems, you are completely enclosed, isolated and insensitive. In that state you are obviously unconscious, the response of the conscious being blocked. When the mind is artificially made quiet, the upper layer of the mind is able to receive intimations, not only from its own unconscious, but from the collective unconscious; and the intimations are translated according to the conditioned mind. Therefore a Hitler can say he is guided by God in what he does, and somebody else in India that God is all for something quite different. It is a very simple psychological process which you can discover for yourself if you watch your own mind in action and see how it can hypnotize itself into tranquillity. Therefore, when the mind is forced into stillness through concentration, through conformity, through any kind of discipline or self-hypnosis, it is obviously incapable of discovering reality. It can project itself and hear its own ugly voice, which we call the voice of God, but surely that is entirely different from the state of a mind that is really still.

Now, the mind is active, it is constantly thinking of the things that have been and the things that will be; and how can such a mind be still—not be made still, which any fool can do? How is the mind to be really still? Surely, the mind is still only when it understands its own activity. As the waters of a pond become very quiet, very peaceful, when the breezes stop, so the mind is still when it is no longer creating problems. So, our question is, not how to make the mind still, but how to understand the creator of problems; because, the moment you understand the creator of problems, the mind is still. Do not close your eyes and go off because that word 'still' is mentioned. The understanding of the creator of problems brings tranquillity to the mind. So, you have to understand thought, because thought is the maker of problems. Thought creates the thinker, thought is always seeking a permanent state; seeing its own state of transition, of flux, of impermanence, thought creates an entity which it calls the thinker, the Atman, the Paramatman, the soul—a higher and higher security. That is, thought creates an entity which it calls the observer, the experiencer, the permanent thinker as distinct from the impermanent thought; and the wide distance between the two creates the conflict of time.

Now, the understanding of this whole process of thought creating the thinker, and the incarnation of thought as the thinker, brings about tranquillity of mind. This means that one has to understand what is thought. What is this thing which you call thinking? Until we understand that, whatever thought does only creates more confusion; until we know the whole significance and depth of thought, the conscious as well as the unconscious, the individual as well as the collective, merely to indulge in further thinking, further speculation, only creates

more misery. So, a mind which is ceaselessly active, chattering, always using the present as a passage from the past to the future, how can such a mind be still? Such a mind can never be still. A stupid mind is always stupid, it can never become intelligent; you may become what you call clever, but that is only further stupidity. A mind that is wandering cannot be still, cannot be tranquil. It is only when the mind understands its own process, when it begins to be aware of itself, that you will see the end of thought. After all, what is our thinking, of which we are so proud? Our thinking, surely, is merely the response of memory, the response of experience, which we call knowledge; our thinking is merely the response of yesterday, is it not? And how can such thinking, which is of time, understand something which is beyond time?

Sir, is it not important for the mind to be aware of its own action—not as an entity apart from action, but aware of itself as action? And it can be aware only in relation to property, to people, to ideas. It is in understanding relationship that we understand thought; for there is no thinker apart from thought, no thinker who thinks thoughts: there is only thought. When we see the truth of that, then the thinker is not; and when there is no thinker, the mind becomes very quiet. When there is no entity attempting to make the mind still, then the mind, which is only the result of time, of the past, becomes still of itself; and then only is it possible to understand truth, or for truth to come into being. Truth is not a thing of memory, truth is not of knowledge, of information. Truth is neither of the mind nor of emotion, it has nothing to do with sensations, it is not the projection of the self as the image, the voice of the Almighty. Truth is not of memory, therefore truth is not of time. As truth is not of the mind,

it can come into being only when the mind is still, when thought is silent. Truth must be seen from moment to moment, and it is only truth that can resolve our problems, not the mind or the inventions of the mind.

February 19, 1950

III

TALK IN BOMBAY

I would again like to lay emphasis on the importance of listening rightly. Most of us listen without understanding, we listen merely to words; but the word is not the thing, the word can never be the real. The word becomes real only when it has deep significance, but to catch the deep significance of the word one must know how to listen. This evening I want to talk about the question of virtue, and perhaps it may be something which is not along the old traditional line, it may be something new; so I hope you will kindly listen to it without any resistance, without denial. Listen to it with the intention of really grasping its significance, and then perhaps we shall be able to understand the extraordinary importance of virtue. The difficulty in grasping the significance of whatever is said will be, I am quite sure, to cross the barriers of our own prejudices and personal experiences.

Now, virtue is essential, and to understand it we have to go beyond the struggle to be virtuous, beyond the conventional meaning or definition of that word. Because we have made virtue into something very tiresome and tedious, something very ugly, there is no joy in being virtuous. It is a constant effort, it is a strain, a travail. Virtue is a fact, and to understand the fact one must be free to look at it as a fact. It is only the unhappy man who struggles to be virtuous, and the very struggle to be virtuous is the denial of virtue;

but the man who is free from unhappiness, from strife, from struggle, such a person is virtuous without effort. The understanding of a fact is extraordinarily difficult, because the fact is one thing, and the desire to change the fact is another. To understand the fact is to be virtuous. Anger is a fact, and to understand it without condemning it, without trying to defend it or find excuses for it, liberates one from the fact; and liberation from the fact is virtue. So, virtue is in the understanding of the fact, whatever it be, not in becoming something away from the fact.

With most of us, virtue is the ideal, which is a means of escape from the fact; and therefore we are never virtuous at any time. We are always becoming virtuous and therefore we are not virtuous. Surely, one must see the fact of what one is, whatever it be, without denial, acceptance or identification; because, when one identifies oneself with a fact, accepts or denies it, one does not understand the fact. Mere denial or acceptance is obviously not understanding. So, virtue is not an end to be pursued. The understanding of the fact is virtue, and without virtue there can be no freedom. It is the unvirtuous who are not free, and it is only in freedom that truth can be discovered. Freedom is virtue, and virtue is understanding the fact of what you are, which is not an ultimate process. You can see the fact immediately, so virtue is immediate, not in the future. If you will think about this, you will see the significance of it. Naturally we have not the time to go into all the details; but if you can see the fact of what you are as you would see any other fact, then you will discover there is a freedom from that fact; and it is only in that freedom that truth can be realized.

So, virtue is not a process, not an ultimate thing to be gained or to be practised. What is practised merely

becomes habit, and habit can never be virtue. Habit is merely an automatic response. A fact is something that is constantly fresh, free; but a virtue that is practised only leads to respectability, and a respectable man can never be happy. Happiness is not something that is gained by position, prestige, it is not arrived at through any means. We say we are happy because we have money, a position, or some means of sensation; but surely, that is not happiness. Happiness is a state of being in which there is no dependence; for where there is dependence there is fear, and a man who is fearful can never be happy, however much he may cover up his fear. There is happiness only in freedom, and there must be virtue for freedom. An unvirtuous man can never be free because his mind is confused. So, the understanding of the fact is freedom from that fact, and freedom from the fact is virtue. It is only when there is freedom that there is discovery, and freedom is not at the end, but at the beginning. Truth is not something distant: It must be discovered in the immediate, in the very first step. To discover the truth in the immediate there must be freedom, which means the understanding of the fact, which is virtue.

Now I shall answer some questions. It is always difficult to answer questions, and to be precise, because life is not a matter of 'yes' and 'no'. It is much too vast to be encompassed by a few words, it is too vital to be put in a frame. But if we can see the significance of the problem, then the answer is in the problem itself. It is open to anyone to discover the significance, the beauty, the truth of the problem, and that is possible only when you can see the fact and do not wander away from the fact.

Question : One watches the people near you for any visible sign of transformation. How do you explain

that, while you walk in light, your nearest followers remain dull and ugly in their life and their behaviour?

KRISHNAMURTI : First of all, the follower destroys the leader. To follow anyone is not to find truth. If one would understand what truth is, there can be neither the follower nor the teacher. There is no guru who will lead you to truth, and to follow anyone is to deny that freedom which virtue brings. This is not a mere rhetorical response. Just see the truth of it, that to follow authority of any kind is to deny intelligence. We follow because we ourselves are in confusion, and out of that confusion we choose the leader; therefore the leader also can only be confused. (Laughter.) Sir, please do not laugh it off. You choose the guru to have your appetite for security satisfied, and what you follow is your own projection, your own gratification, not the truth. When you follow somebody you are destroying that somebody, which is to destroy yourself. I have no followers, nor am I a teacher to anybody; if I were, you would destroy me and I would destroy you. Then there would be no love between us, there would be mere following; for those who follow and those who lead have no love in their hearts.

Now, the questioner is very concerned with those who are about me. Why? Why is he concerned with whether others are beautiful or ugly? Surely, what is important is one's own condition, not that of another. If my mind is petty, narrow, limited, then I will see the same in others. This desire to criticize others is really quite extraordinary. How can I know what another is when I do not know what I myself am? How can I judge another when my own measurement is at fault? What is the instrument, the balance by which I weigh another when I do not know the whole process of my-

self? And when I do away with the 'myself' in its totality, there is no time to judge another, nor do I feel the inclination to judge another. It is the sluggish, agitated, worrying mind that judges, it is the restless mind that is forever criticizing others; and how can a restless mind that does not know itself ever look clearly at anything? It is only when you are capable of looking at things directly and clearly that you are free of those things.

The third point in this question is, is it not?, how do you know that I "walk in light"? You assume that I do, but how can you know anything about it? This extraordinary desire to accept and to take things for granted is one of the indications of a dull mind. On the contrary, you should be skeptical. Skepticism is not cynicism or denial; it is the state of a mind that does not agree quickly, that does not accept or take things for granted. A mind that accepts is seeking, not enlightenment or wisdom, but refuge. The important thing is, surely, not whether I walk in light, but whether you do. It is your life, not mine; it is your happiness, your strife, your misery. What is the good of thinking someone else walks in light? He may or may not; and of what value is it to you when you are yourself in misery? If you merely believe in the light of another, you become a follower, a copyist, an imitator, which means you are a gramophone record playing some tune over and over again without a song in your own heart.

In this question there is also another point: instead of criticizing, tackling me, you go for the so-called followers. It is like whipping a boy instead of the king; the king can do no wrong, so you go for the boy. Similarly, you go for those whom you regard as my followers. Fortunately there are no followers as far as I am concerned. As I said, to follow anyone is destruction, and that is what is the matter with the world

at the present time. We are mere copyists, imitators; we follow eagerly, both politically and religiously, and so we are led to destruction. This does not mean that we must become rampant individualists, which is the other extreme; but to be able to live happily, to see the truth for oneself, does not demand following another. A happy man does not follow. It is the miserable, the confused man who eagerly pursues another, hoping for refuge; and he will find a refuge, but that refuge is his darkness, it is his undoing. It is only the man who tries to find out the fact of what he is in himself that will know freedom and therefore happiness.

Question: The more one listens to you, the more one feels that you are preaching withdrawal from life. I am a clerk in the Secretariat, I have four children, and I get only Rs. 125/- a month. Will you please explain how I can fight the gloomy struggle for existence in the new way you are proposing? Do you really think that your message can mean anything significant to the starving and the stunted wage-earner? Have you lived among such people?

KRISHNAMURTI: First of all, let us dispose of the question as to whether I have lived among such people. It implies, does it not?, that in order to understand life, you must go through every phase of life, every experience, you must live among the poor and the rich, you must starve and pass through every condition of existence. Now, to put the problem very briefly, must you go through drunkenness to know sobriety? Does not one experience fully, completely understood, reveal the whole process of life? Must you go through all the phases of life to understand life? Please see that this is not an avoidance of the question—on the contrary. We think that to know wisdom we must go through every phase of life and ex-

perience, from the rich man to the poor man, from the beggar to the king. Now, is that so? Is wisdom the accumulation of many experiences? Or is wisdom to be found in the complete understanding of one experience? Because we never completely and fully understand one experience, we wander from experience to experience, hoping for some salvation, for some refuge, for some happiness. So, we have made our life a process of continuous accumulation of experiences, and therefore it is an endless struggle, a ceaseless battle to attain, to acquire. Surely, that is a tedious, an utterly stupid approach to life, is it not?

Is it not possible to gather the full significance of an experience and so understand the whole width and depth of life? I say it is possible, and that it is the only way to understand life. Whatever the experience, whatever the challenge and response to life, if one can understand it fully, then the pursuit of every experience has no meaning, it becomes merely a waste of time. Because we are incapable of doing that, we have invented the illusory idea that by accumulating experiences we shall ultimately arrive, God knows where.

Now, the questioner wants to know if I am preaching withdrawal from life. What do we mean by life? I am thinking out this problem aloud, so let us follow it together. What do we mean by life? Living is possible only in relationship, is it not? If there is no relationship, there is no life. To be, is to be related; life is a process of relationship, of being in communion with another, with two or ten, with society. Life is not a process of isolation, of withdrawal. But for most of us, living is a process of isolation, is it not? We are struggling to isolate ourselves in action, in relationship. All our activities are self-enclosing, narrowing down, isolating, and in that very process there is friction, sorrow, pain.

Living is relationship, and nothing can exist in isolation; therefore there can be no withdrawal from life. On the contrary, there must be the understanding of relationship—your relationship with your wife, your children, with society, with nature, with the beauty of this day, the sunlight on the waters, the flight of a bird, with the things that you possess and the ideals that control you. To understand all that, you do not withdraw from it. Truth is not found in withdrawal and isolation; on the contrary, in isolation, whether it is conscious or unconscious, there is only darkness and death.

So, I am not proposing a withdrawal from life, a suppression of life; on the contrary, we can understand life only in relationship. It is because we do not understand life that we are all the time making an effort to withdraw, to isolate; and having created a society based on violence, on corruption, God becomes the ultimate isolation.

Then the questioner wants to know how, earning so little, he is to live what we are talking about. Now, first of all, the earning of a livelihood is not only the problem of the man who earns little, but it is also yours and mine, is it not? You may have a little more money, you may be well off, have a better job, a better position, a bigger bank-account; but it is also your problem and mine, because this society is what all of us have created. Until we three—you, I and another—really understand relationship, we cannot bring about revolution in society. The man who has no food in his stomach obviously cannot find reality, he must first be fed; but the man whose stomach is full, surely it is his immediate responsibility to see that there is a fundamental revolution in society, that things do not go on as they are. To think, to feel out all these problems is much more the responsibility of those who have time, who have leisure, than it is of the man who earns little and has such

a struggle to make both ends meet, who has no time and is worn out by this rotten, exploiting society. So, it is you and I, those of us who have a little more time and leisure, who must go into these problems completely—which does not mean that we have to become professional talkers, offering one system as a substitute for another. It is for you and I who have time, who have leisure for thought, to seek out the way of a new society, a new culture.

Now, what happens to the poor man who is earning Rs. 125/-, or whatever it is? He has to carry the family with him, he has to accept the superstitions of his grandmother, his aunts, nephews, and so on; he has to marry according to a certain pattern, he has to do Puja, ceremonies, and fit in with all that superstitious nonsense. He is caught in it; and if he rebels, you, the respectable people, throttle him.

So, the question of right livelihood is your problem and mine, is it not? But most of us are not concerned with right livelihood at all, we are glad and thankful simply to have a job; and so we maintain a society, a culture, that renders right livelihood impossible. Sirs, do not treat it theoretically. If you find yourself in a wrong vocation and actually do something about it, do you not see what a revolution it will bring in your life and in the life of those around you? But if you listen casually and carry on as before because you have a good job and for you there is no problem, obviously you will continue to cause misery in the world. For the man with too little money there is a problem; but he, like the rest of us, is only concerned with having more, and when he gets more the problem continues, because he wants still more.

Now, what is a right means of livelihood? Obviously, there are certain occupations that are detrimental to society. The army is detrimental to society, because it plans and

encourages murder in the name of the country. Because you are a nationalist, holding to sovereign governments, you must have armed forces to protect your property; and property is much more important to you than life, the life of your son. That is why you have conscription, that is why your schools are being encouraged to have military training. So, in the name of your country you are destroying your children. Your country is yourself identified, your own projection, and when you worship your country you are sacrificing your children to the worship of yourself. That is why the army, which is the instrument of a separate and sovereign government, is a wrong means of livelihood. But it is made easy to enter the army, and it becomes a sure means of earning a little money. Just see this extraordinary fact in modern civilization. Surely, the army is a wrong way to earn one's livelihood, because it is based on planned and calculated destruction; and until you and I see the truth of this we are not going to bring about any different kind of society.

Similarly, you can see that a job in a police force is a wrong means of livelihood. Do not smile and pass it off. The police becomes a means of investigating private lives. We are not talking of the police as a means of helping, guiding, but as an instrument of the state, the secret police, and all the rest of it. Then the individual becomes merely an instrument of society, the individual has no privacy, no freedom, no rights of his own; he is investigated, controlled, shaped by the government, which is society. Obviously, that is a wrong means of livelihood.

Then there is the profession of law. Is that not a wrong means of livelihood? I see some of you are smiling. Probably you are lawyers, and you know better than I do what that system is based on. Fundamentally, not superficially, it is based on maintaining things as they are, on dis-

agreements, disputation, confusion, quarrels, encouraging disruption and disorder in the name of order.

There is also the wrong profession of the man who wants to become rich, the big business man, the man who is gathering, accumulating, storing up money through exploitation, through ruthlessness—though he may do it in the name of philanthropy or in the name of education.

Obviously, then, these are all wrong means of livelihood; and a complete change in the social structure, a revolution of the right kind, is possible only when it begins with you. Revolution cannot be based on an ideal or a system; but when you see all this as a fact, you are liberated from it, and therefore you are free to act. But, Sirs, you do not want to act; you are afraid of being disturbed, and you say, 'There is already sufficient confusion, please do not make any more'. If you do not make more confusion, others are there making it for you—and utilizing that confusion as a means of gaining political power. Surely, it is your responsibility as an individual to see the confusion within and without, and to do something about it—not merely accept it and wait for a miracle, a marvellous Utopia created by others into which you can step without effort.

Sirs, this problem is your problem as well as the poor man's problem. The poor man depends on you and you depend on him; he is your clerk while you ride in a big car and get a fat salary, accumulating money at his expense. So, it is your problem as well as his, and until you and he alter radically in your relationship, there will be no real revolution; though there may be violence and bloodshed, you will maintain things essentially as they are. Therefore, our problem is the transformation of relationship; and that transformation is not on the intellectual or verbal level, but it can take place only when you understand the fact of what you are.

You cannot understand it if you theorize, verbalize, deny or justify, and that is why it is important to understand the whole process of the mind. A revolution which is merely the outcome of the mind, is no revolution at all; but revolution which is not of the mind, which is not of the word, of the system—that is the only revolution, the only solution to the problem. But unfortunately, we have cultivated our brains, our so-called intellects, to such an extent that we have lost all capacities except the merely intellectual and verbal capacity. It is only when we see life as a whole, in its entirety, in its totality, that there is a possibility of a revolution which will give both the poor man and the rich man his due.

Question : The conscious mind is ignorant and afraid of the unconscious mind. You are addressing mainly the conscious mind, and is that enough? Will your method bring about release of the unconscious? Please explain in detail how one can tackle the unconscious mind fully.

KRISHNAMURTI: This is quite a complex and difficult problem, it requires a great deal of penetration, and I hope you will pay attention, not merely verbally, but by really listening and by seeing the truth of it.

Now, we are aware that there is the conscious and the unconscious mind, but most of us function only on the conscious level, in the upper layer of the mind, and our whole life is practically limited to that. We live in the so-called conscious mind and we never pay attention to the deeper unconscious mind, from which there is occasionally an intimation, a hint; but that hint is disregarded, perverted, or translated according to our particular conscious demands at the moment. Now, the questioner asks, "You are addressing mainly the conscious mind and is that

enough?" Let us see what we mean by the conscious mind. Is the conscious mind different from the unconscious mind? We have divided the conscious from the unconscious; and is this justified? Is this true? Is there such a division between the conscious and the unconscious? Is there a definite barrier, a line where the conscious ends and the unconscious begins? We are aware that the upper layer, the conscious mind, is active; but is that the only instrument that is active throughout the day? So, if I were addressing merely the upper layer of the mind, then surely what I am saying would be valueless, it would have no meaning. And yet most of us cling to what the conscious mind has accepted, because the conscious mind finds it convenient to adjust to certain obvious facts; but the unconscious may rebel, and often does, and so there is conflict between the so-called conscious and the unconscious.

So, our problem is this, is it not? There is in fact only one state, not two states such as the conscious and the unconscious; there is only a state of being, which is consciousness, though you may divide it as the conscious and the unconscious. But that consciousness is always of the past, never of the present; you are conscious only of things that are over. You are conscious of hearing me the second it is over, are you not?; you understand it a moment later. You are never conscious or aware of the now. Watch your own hearts and minds and you will see that consciousness is functioning between the past and the future, and that the present is merely a passage of the past to the future. So, consciousness is a movement of the past to the future. Please follow this. It is a little too abstract to give examples, similes; and to think in similes is not to think at all, because similes are limited. You must think abstractly or negatively, which is the highest form of thinking.

If you watch your own mind at work, you will see that the movement to the past and to the future is a process in which the present is not. Either the past is a means of escape from the present, which may be unpleasant, or the future is a hope away from the present. So, the mind is occupied with the past or with the future and sloughs off the present. That is, the mind is conditioned by the past, conditioned as an Indian, a Brahmin or a non-Brahmin, a Christian, a Buddhist, and so on, and that conditioned mind projects itself into the future; therefore it is never capable of looking directly and impartially at any fact. It either condemns and rejects the fact, or accepts and identifies itself with the fact. Such a mind is obviously not capable of seeing any fact as a fact. That is our state of consciousness, which is conditioned by the past, and our thought is the conditioned response to the challenge of a fact; and the more you respond according to the conditioning of belief, of the past, the more there is the strengthening of the past. That strengthening of the past is obviously the continuity of itself, which it calls the future. So, that is the state of our mind, of our consciousness—a pendulum swinging backwards and forwards between the past and the future. That is our consciousness, which is made up not only of the upper layers of the mind, but of the deeper layers as well. Such consciousness obviously cannot function at a different level, because it only knows those two movements of backwards and forwards.

Now, if you watch very carefully you will see that it is not a constant movement, but that there is an interval between two thoughts; though it may be but an infinitesimal fraction of a second, there is an interval that has significance in the swinging backwards and forwards of the pendulum. So, we see the fact that our thinking is conditioned by the past,

which is projected into the future ; and the moment you admit the past, you must also admit the future ; because, there are not two states as the past and the future, but one state which includes both the conscious and the unconscious, both the collective past and the individual past. The collective and the individual past, in response to the present, give out certain responses which create the individual consciousness ; therefore, consciousness is of the past, and that is the whole background of our existence. And the moment you have the past, you inevitably have the future, because the future is merely the continuity of the modified past ; but it is still the past. So, our problem is how to bring about a transformation in this process of the past without creating another conditioning, another past. I hope you are following all this. If it is not clear, perhaps we will discuss it on Tuesday or Thursday.

To put it differently, the problem is this : Most of us reject one particular form of conditioning and find another form, a wider, more significant or more pleasant conditioning. You give up one religion and take on another, reject one form of belief and accept another. Such substitution is obviously not understanding life, life being relationship. So, our problem is how to be free from all conditioning. Either you say it is impossible, that no human mind can ever be free from conditioning ; or you begin to experiment, to enquire, to discover. If you assert that it is impossible, obviously you are out of the running. Your assertion may be based on limited or wide experience, or on the mere acceptance of a belief ; but such assertion is the denial of search, of research, of enquiry, of discovery. To find out if it is possible for the mind to be completely free from all conditioning, you must be free to enquire and to discover.

Now, I say it is definitely possible for the mind to be free from all

conditioning—not that you should accept my authority. If you accept it on authority, you will never discover, it will be another substitution, and that will have no significance. When I say it is possible, I say it because for me it is a fact, and I will show it to you verbally ; but if you are to find the truth of it for yourself, you must experiment with it and follow it swiftly.

The understanding of the whole process of conditioning does not come to you through analysis or introspection ; because, the moment you have the analyzer, that very analyzer himself is part of the background, and therefore his analysis is of no significance. That is a fact, and you must put it aside. The analyzer who examines, who analyzes the thing which he is looking at, is himself part of the conditioned state, and therefore whatever his interpretation, his understanding, his analysis may be, it is still part of the background. So that way there is no escape ; and to break the background is essential, because to meet the challenge of the new, the mind must be new ; to discover God, truth, or what you will, the mind must be fresh, uncontaminated by the past. To analyze the past, to arrive at conclusions through a series of experiments, to make assertions and denials, and all the rest of it, implies, in its very essence, the continuance of the background in different forms ; and when you see the truth of that fact, then you will discover that the analyzer has come to an end. The background is still there, but the analyzer has come to an end. Then there is no entity apart from the background : there is only thought as the background, thought being the response of memory, both conscious and unconscious, individual and collective.

So, the mind is the result of the past, which is the process of conditioning ; and how is it possible for the mind to be free ? To be free,

the mind must not only see and understand its pendulum-like swing between the past and the future, but also be aware of the interval between thoughts. That interval is spontaneous, it is not brought about through any causation, through any wish, through any compulsion. Just experiment with me this evening and see your own mind in operation as I go slowly into the matter. Don't worry, I am not mesmerizing you. (Laughter.) I am not interested in mesmerizing or influencing you, because to be mesmerized, to be influenced, consciously or unconsciously, is to become a follower; and to become a follower is to destroy yourself and him whom you follow, and therefore there is no love between us. When there is love, there is no mesmerism, there is neither the follower nor the teacher, neither the man nor the woman, there is only that flame of love; and it is that love which brings communion between us.

Now, although it is difficult with a large audience, this evening I am going to try to show how the mind actually works; and you can experiment and see it for yourself. We know thinking is a response of the background. You think as a Hindu, as a Parsee, as a Buddhist, or as God knows what else, not only in your conscious thinking, but also in your unconscious thinking. You are the background, you are not separate, there is no thinker apart from the background; and the response of that background is what you call thinking. That background, whether it is cultured or uncultured, learned or ignorant, is constantly responding to any challenge, to any stimulant, and that response creates not only the so-called present, but also the future; and that is our process of thinking.

Now, if you watch very carefully, you will see that though the response, the movement of thought, seems so swift, there are gaps, there are intervals between thoughts. Between two thoughts there is a period of silence

which is not related to the thought process. If you observe you will see that that period of silence, that interval, is not of time; and the discovery of that interval, the full experiencing of that interval, liberates you from conditioning—or rather, it does not liberate 'you', but there is liberation from conditioning. So, the understanding of the process of thinking is meditation—which we will discuss another time. We are now not only discussing the structure and the process of thought, which is the background of memory, of experience, of knowledge, but we are also trying to find out if the mind can liberate itself from the background. It is only when the mind is not giving continuity to thought, when it is still with a stillness that is not induced, that is without any causation—it is only then that there can be freedom from the background. I hope I have explained this question sufficiently.

Question : Why does the human mind cling so persistently to the idea of God in many different ways? Can you deny that belief in God has brought consolation and meaning to lonely and desolate people all over the world? Why are you depriving man of this consolation by preaching a new type of nihilism?

KRISHNAMURTI: Sirs, this is as important a question as the previous one, because all vital human questions are important. So please do not resist, but try to understand what I am talking about, and you will see.

Now, belief is a denial of truth, belief hinders truth; to believe in God is not to find God. Neither the believer nor the non-believer will find God; because, reality is the unknown, and your belief or non-belief in the unknown is merely a self-projection and therefore not real. So, if I may suggest, do not resist, but

let us go into it together. I know you believe, and I know it has very little meaning in your life. There are many people who believe, millions believe in God and take consolation. First of all, why do you believe? You believe because it gives you satisfaction, consolation, hope, and you say it gives significance to life. But actually your belief has very little significance, because you believe and exploit, you believe and kill, you believe in a universal God and murder each other. The rich man also believes in God; he exploits ruthlessly, accumulates money, and then builds a temple or becomes a philanthropist. Is that belief in God? And the man who drops an atomic bomb says that God is his co-pilot on the airplane. (Laughter.) Do not laugh, Sirs. Your turn is coming also. The man who plans murder on a vast scale calls on the Almighty; the man who is cruel to his wife, to his children, to his neighbour, he also sings, sits down, kneels, clasps his hands and calls on the name of God.

So, you all believe in different ways, but your belief has no reality whatsoever. Reality is what you are, what you do, what you think, and your belief in God is merely an escape from your monotonous, stupid and cruel life. Furthermore, belief invariably divides people: there is the Parsee, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Christian, the communist, the socialist, the capitalist, and so on. Belief, idea, divides; it never brings people together. You may bring a few people together in a group, but that group is opposed to another group. So, ideas and beliefs are never unifying; on the contrary, they are separative, disintegrating and destructive. Therefore your belief in God is really spreading misery in the world; though it may have brought you momentary consolation, in actuality it has brought you more misery and destruction in the form of wars, famines, class-divisions, and

the ruthless action of separate individuals. So, your belief has no validity at all. If you really believed in God, if it were a real experience to you, then your face would have a smile, then you would not be destroying human beings. I am not being rhetorical; but please look at the facts first.

You do not really believe in God, because if you did you would not be rich, you would have no temples, you would have no poor people, you would not be a philanthropist with a big title after exploiting people. So, your belief in God is worthless; and though it may give you temporary consolation, compensate for and hide you from your own misery, give you a respectable escape which mankind recognizes as making you a religious person, it is all without validity, it has no significance whatsoever. What is significant is your life, the way you live, the way you treat your servant, the way you look at another human being.

So, what I am preaching is not negation. I am saying that you spread misery by clinging to illusions which help you to avoid looking at things as they are. To face a fact is freedom from the fact, and belief is a hindrance to the perception of what is. After all, your belief is the result of your conditioning. You can be conditioned to believe in God, and another can be conditioned not to believe, to deny that there is God. Obviously, then, belief impedes the realization of what is; and to see the truth of this fact is to be free from belief. Then only can the mind enquire and find out if there is that thing which is called God.

Now, what is reality, what is God? God is not the word, the word is not the thing. To know that which is immeasurable, which is not of time, the mind must be free of time, which means the mind be free from all thought, from all ideas about God. Because, what do you know about God or truth? You

do not really know anything about that reality. All that you know are words, the experiences of others, or some moments of rather vague experience of your own. Surely, that is not God, that is not reality, that is not beyond the field of time. So, to know that which is beyond time, the process of time must be understood, time being thought, the process of becoming, the accumulation of knowledge. That is the whole background of the mind; the mind itself is the background, both the conscious and the unconscious, the collective and the individual. So, the mind must be free of the known, which means the mind must be completely silent, not made silent. The mind that achieves silence as a result, as the outcome of determined action, of practice, of discipline, is not a silent mind. The mind that is forced, controlled, shaped, put into a frame and kept quiet, is not a still mind. You may succeed for a period of time in forcing the mind to be superficially silent, but such a mind is not a still mind. Stillness comes only when you understand the whole process of thought; because, to understand the process is to end the process, and the ending of the process of thought is the beginning of silence. Only when the mind is completely silent, not only on the upper level, but fundamentally, right through, on both the superficial and the deeper levels of consciousness—only then can the unknown come into being. The unknown is not something to be experienced by the mind; silence alone can be experienced, nothing but silence. If the mind experiences anything but silence, it is merely projecting its own desires, and such a mind is not silent; and as long as the mind is not silent, as long as thought in any form, conscious or unconscious, is in movement, there can be no silence. Silence is freedom from the past, from knowledge, from both conscious and unconscious memory; and

when the mind is completely silent, not in use, when there is the silence which is not a product of effort, then only does the timeless, the eternal come into being. That state is not a state of remembering—there is no entity that remembers, that experiences. So, God or truth, or what you will, is a thing that comes into being from moment to moment, and it happens only in a state of freedom and spontaneity, not when the mind is disciplined according to a pattern. God is not a thing of the mind, it does not come through self-projection, it comes only when there is virtue, which is freedom. Virtue is facing the fact of what is, and the facing of the fact is a state of bliss. Only when the mind is blissful, quiet, without any movement of its own, without the projection of thought, conscious or unconscious—only then does the eternal come into being.

February 26, 1950

IV

TALK IN BOMBAY

Unless we understand the whole problem of effort, the question of action will not be completely understood. Most of us live by a series of efforts, striving to achieve a result, striving either for the general welfare, for general upliftment, or to achieve personal advancement. Effort is ultimately, is it not?, a process of ambition, whether collective or individual; and it is ambition that seems to drive most of us into political activity or into work for social and religious advancement. For most of us, ambition seems to be the goal, the way of living; and when the pursuits of that ambition are thwarted, there is frustration, there is sorrow, leading to a series of escapes. Surely, effort ultimately implies, not only the ambition for personal advancement, but also the ambition for social and political advancement; and if we do not suc-

ceed in worldly matters, we turn our ambition to so-called spiritual matters. If I do not become somebody in this world, I want to become somebody in the next world, and that is considered to be spiritual, more worthy, more significant; but ambition in any direction, by whatever name we may call it, is still ambition. The acquiring of capacity, of technique and efficiency, the desire for the power to do good, for the power to speak, to write, to think clearly, the desire for power in any form, implies ambition, does it not? And does the search for power bring about creation or creativeness? Does creativeness come into being through effort, through advancement, personal or collective? Does creativeness come into being through the cultivation of capacity and efficiency, which is ultimately power? Until we understand the state of being which is creation, until there is that ingrained sense of creativeness, conflict is inevitable. If we can understand that question of creation, then perhaps we shall be able to act without multiplying the problems through action; and to understand the state of creativeness, surely we must understand the process of effort.

Now, where there is effort to achieve something, obviously there cannot be understanding. Understanding comes only when there is the cessation of the whole process, the whole mechanism of striving to be or not to be, to advance or not to advance. It is really only the imitator who makes an effort to become something, and the man who has disciplined his mind according to a certain pattern is obviously an imitator, a copyist. He must make an effort to conform to the pattern, and conformity to the pattern he calls living. However subtle, however hidden and widely extended, any effort in which there is imitation, copy, is obviously not creation. Because most of us are caught in imitation, we have lost the feeling for creation, and having lost

it, we get entangled in technique, in making effort more and more perfect, more and more efficient, that is, we develop more and more technical capacity without having the flame; and the search for efficiency in action without the flame is the curse of the present age. Most of us who are concerned with action which we hope will bring about a revolution are caught in action based on an idea, which is merely copy, and therefore it is invalid. Surely, our problem—sociological, religious, individual, collective, or what you will—can be solved only when we understand the whole process, the mechanism of effort; and the understanding of effort is meditation.

So, until we understand and are utterly free from the whole process of ambition, which is the search for power, for efficiency, for domination, there cannot be creative action; and it is only the creative man who can solve these problems, not the man who is merely copying a pattern, however efficient, however worthy. The search for a pattern is not the search for creation, the search for a pattern is not the search for true revolution. As long as we do not understand the process of effort, in which is implied power, imitation, ambition, there cannot be creation. It is only the creative man who is happy, and only the happy man is virtuous; and the happy, virtuous man is a really creative social entity who will bring about revolution.

There are several questions. To most of us, the problems of life are not very serious, and we want ready-made answers. We do not want to delve into the problem, we do not want to think it out completely, fully, and understand the whole significance of it; we want to be told the answer, and the more gratifying the answer, the quicker we accept it. When we are made to think about a problem, when we have to go into it, our minds rebel, because we are

not used to enquiring into problems. In considering these questions, if you merely wait for a ready-made answer from me, I am afraid you will be disappointed; but if we can go into the question together, think it out anew, not according to old patterns, then perhaps we shall be able to solve the many problems which confront us, and which we are usually so unwilling to look at. We have to look at them, that is, there must be the capacity to face the fact; and we cannot face the fact, whatever it be, as long as we have explanations, as long as words fill our minds. It is words, explanations, memories, that cloud the understanding of the fact. The fact is always new, because the fact is a challenge; but the fact ceases to be a challenge, it is not new, when we consider it merely as the old and discard it. So, in considering these questions, I hope you and I will think out the problem together. I am not laying down the answer, but we are going to think out each problem together and discover the truth of it.

Question : You seem to be preaching something very akin to the teachings of the 'Upanishads'; why then are you upset if someone quotes from sacred books? Do you mean to suggest that you are expounding something no one has ever said before? Does quotation from another person interfere with the peculiar technique of hypnotism which you are employing?

KRISHNAMURTI: Why do you quote and why do you compare? Either you quote because you say, 'By quoting I can compare and understand'; or you quote because in your mind you are nothing else but quotation. (Laughter.) Do not laugh, Sirs, just see the truth of the matter. A gramophone record repeats what someone else has said. Has that any validity in the search of truth? Do you understand by

quoting the *Upanishads* or any other book? No book is sacred, I assure you; like the newspaper, it is only words printed on paper, and there is nothing sacred in either. Now, you quote because you think that by quoting and comparing you will understand what I am talking about. Do we understand anything through comparison, or does understanding come only when you deal directly with whatever is said? When you say that the *Upanishads* have said it, or someone else has said it, what is actually taking place in your psychological process? By saying that someone else has said it, you do not have to think any more about it, do you? You think you have understood the *Upanishads*; and when you compare what the *Upanishads* say with what I am saying, you say it is alike, and you give no further thought to the problem. That is, by comparing you are really seeking a state in which you will not be disturbed. After all, when you have read the *Upanishads* or the *Bhagavad Gita* and think you have understood it, you can settle back and keep on repeating it, and it will have no effect on your daily life; you can keep on reading and quoting and be undisturbed, perfectly safe. Then you are very respectable, and you can carry on with your daily life, which is monstrously ugly and stupid; and when someone else comes along and points out something, you immediately compare it with what you have read and you think you have understood. Actually, you are avoiding disturbance; that is why you compare, and that is what I object to.

I do not know whether what I am saying is new or old, I am not interested in whether someone else has said it or not; but what I am really interested in is to find out the truth of every problem—not according to the *Upanishads*, the *Bhagavad Gita*, the *Bible*, or *Sankara*. When you are seeking the truth of a problem, it

is stupid to quote what others have said. Sir, this is not a political meeting, and the question fundamentally is, do you understand anything by comparison? Do you understand life by having your mind full of the sayings of others, by following the experience, the knowledge of others? Or does understanding come only when the mind is still—not made still, which is dullness? Through enquiry, through search, through exploration, inevitably the mind becomes quiet, and then the problem gives its full significance; and it is only when the mind is quiet that there is understanding of the significance of the problem, not when you are constantly comparing, quoting, judging, weighing. Surely, Sir, the man of knowledge, the scholar, can never know truth; on the contrary, knowledge and erudition must come to an end. The mind must be simple to understand truth, not filled with the knowledge of others or with its own restlessness. Look, if you had no books of any kind, no socalled religious or sacred books, what would you do to find truth? If you were interested in it at all, you would have to search your own heart, you would have to seek out the sacred places of your mind, would you not? You would have to look to yourself, you would have to understand the way your mind is working; because, the mind is the only instrument you have, and if you do not understand that instrument, how can you go beyond the mind? Surely, Sir, those who first wrote the sacred books could not have been copyists, could they? They didn't quote somebody else. But we are quoting because our hearts are empty, we are dry, we have nothing in us. We make a lot of noise, and that we call wisdom; and with that knowledge we want to transform the world, and thereby we make more noise. That is why it is important for the mind which really wants to bring about a funda-

mental revolution to be free from copy, from imitation, from patterns.

Now, the questioner asks, "Does quotation from another person interfere with the peculiar technique of hypnotism which you are employing?" Am I hypnotizing you? Don't answer me—because the hypnotized man does not know he is being hypnotized. The problem is not whether I am hypnotizing you, but why you are listening to me. If you are listening merely to find a substitute, another leader, another picture to worship and put flowers before, then what I am saying will be utterly useless. Your walls are already filled with pictures, you have innumerable images, and if you are listening to find further gratification, you will be hypnotized no matter what is said. As long as you are seeking gratification you will find the means that will gratify you, and therefore you will be hypnotized—as most of you are. Those who believe in nationalism are hypnotized; those who believe in certain dogmas about God, about reincarnation, or what you will, are hypnotized by words, by ideas. And you like to be hypnotized, mesmerized, either by another or by yourselves, because in that state you can remain undisturbed; and as long as you are seeking a state in which you will have no disturbance, which you call peace of mind, you will always find the means, the *guru*—anyone or anything that will give you what you want. That state is hypnosis. Surely, that is not what is taking place here, is it? Actually, I am not giving you anything. On the contrary, I say: wake up from your hypnosis; whether you are hypnotized by your *Upanishads*, or by the latest *guru*—be free of them. Look at your own problems; see the truth of the nearest problems, not the farthest, and understand your relationship with society. Surely, that is not to hypnotize you; on the contrary, it is to bring you down to facts, to make you see the facts. The avoid-

ance of the fact, the escape from the fact, is the process of hypnosis, and that is helped along by the newspapers, the cinema, the sacred books, the gurus, the temples, the repetition of words and chants. The fact is not something very extraordinary, the fact is that you are exploiting, that you are responsible for the mess in the world; it is you who are responsible, not some economic maladjustment. That is the fact, which you are unwilling to look at; and as long as you do not want to look at the fact, you will be hypnotized, not by me, but by your own desire, which seeks a way of not being disturbed, of walking along the usual path and becoming respectable. Sir, the respectable man, the so-called religious man, is the hypnotized man, because his ultimate escape is his belief; and that belief is invariably gratifying, it is never disturbing, otherwise he would not believe in it.

So, either the desire for comfort, for security, for gratification, for a state of non-disturbance, creates the outside entity who hypnotizes you, or you are inwardly hypnotized by your own desire for security; but to understand truth, the mind must be free. Freedom is not something to be achieved ultimately, it must be at the beginning; but we do not want to be free at the beginning, because to be free at the beginning means inward revolution, a drastic perception of the facts all the time, which demands constant awareness, alertness of mind. Because we do not want to be awake to the facts, we find the usual ways of escape, either in social activities or personal ambition, and the mind which is caught in social activity and ambition is much more hypnotized than the mind which is merely self-enclosed in its personal misery; but both are hypnotized by their own want, by their own desires. You can be free from your own self-hypnosis only when you understand the whole, total process of yourself; therefore, self-

knowledge is the beginning of freedom, and without self-knowledge you are perpetually in a state of hypnosis.

Question: You are preaching a kind of philosophical anarchism, which is the favourite escape of the high-brow intellectuals. Will not a community always need some form of regulation and authority? What social order could express the values you are upholding?

KRISHNAMURTI: Sir, when life is very difficult, when problems are increasing, we escape either through the intellect or through mysticism. We know the escape through the intellect; rationalization, more and more cunning devices, more and more technique, more and more economic responses to life, all very subtle and intellectual. And there is the escape through mysticism, through the sacred books, through worshipping an established idea—idea being an image, a symbol, a superior entity, or what you will—, thinking that it is not of the mind; but both the intellectual and the mystic are products of the mind. One we call the intellectual high-brow, and the other we despise, because it is the fashion now to despise the mystic, to kick him out; but both function through the mind. The intellectual may be able to talk, to express himself more clearly, but he too withdraws himself into his own ideas and lives there quietly disregarding society and pursuing his illusions, which are born of the mind; so I do not think there is any difference between the two. They are both pursuing illusions of the mind, and neither the high-brow nor the low-brow, neither the mystic, the yogi who escapes, withdraws from the world, nor the commissar, has the answer. It is you and I, ordinary common people, who have to solve this problem without being high-brow or mystical, without

escaping either through rationalization, or through vague terms and getting hypnotized by words, by methods of our own self-projection. What you are the world is, and unless you understand yourself, what you create will always increase confusion and misery; but the understanding of yourself is not a process through which you have to go in order to act. It is not that you must first understand yourself and then act; on the contrary the understanding of yourself is in the very action of relationship. Action is relationship in which you understand yourself, in which you see yourself clearly; but if you wait to become perfect or to understand yourself, that waiting is dying. Most of us have been active, and that activity has left us empty, dry; and once we have been bitten, we wait and do not act further, because we say, 'I won't act until I understand'. Waiting to understand is a process of death; but if you understand the whole problem of action, of living from moment to moment, which does not demand waiting, then understanding is in what you are doing, it is in action itself, it is not separate from living. Living is action, living is relationship, and because we do not understand relationship, because we avoid relationship, we are caught in words; and words have mesmerized us into action that leads to further chaos and misery.

"Will not a community always need some form of regulation and authority?" Obviously there must be authority as long as a community is based on violence. Is not our present social structure based on violence, on intolerance? The community is you and another in relationship; and is not your relationship based on violence? Are you not ultimately out for yourself, either as a commissar or as a yogi? The yogi wants his salvation first, and so does the commissar, only you call it

hy different names. Is not our present relationship based on violence—violence being the process of self-enclosure, isolation? Is not our daily action a process of isolation? And since each one is isolating himself, there must be authority to bring about cohesion, either the authority of the state, or the authority of organized religion. To the extent that we have been held together at all, we have been held so far through fear of religion or through fear of government; but a man who understands relationship, whose life is not based on violence, has no need for authority. The man who needs authority is the stupid man, the violent man, the unhappy man—which is yourself. You seek authority because you think that without it you are lost; that is why you have all these religions, illusions, and beliefs, that is why you have innumerable leaders, political as well as religious. In moments of confusion you produce the leader, and that leader you follow; and since he is the outcome of your own confusion, obviously the leader himself must be confused. So, authority is necessary as long as you are producing conflict, misery and violence in your relationships.

"What social order could express the values you are upholding?" Sir, do you understand what values I am upholding? Am I upholding anything—at least, for those few who have listened with serious intention? I am not giving you a new set of values for an old set of values, I am not giving you a substitution; but I say, look at the very things that you hold, examine them, search out their truth, and the values that you then establish will create the new society. It is not for somebody else to draw up a blueprint which you can follow blindly without knowing what it is all about, but it is for you to find out for yourself the value, the truth of each

problem. What I am saying is very clear and simple if you will follow it. Society is your own product, it is your projection. The world's problem is your problem, and to understand that problem you have to understand yourself; and you can understand yourself only in relationship, not in escapes. Because you escape through them, your religion, your knowledge, have no validity, no significance. You are unwilling to alter fundamentally your relationship with another because that means trouble, that means disturbance, revolution; so you talk about the *high-brow intellectual, the mystic*, and all the rest of that nonsense. Sir, a new society, a new order, cannot be established by another; it must be established by you. A revolution based on an idea is not a revolution at all. Real revolution comes from within, and that revolution is not brought about through escape, but comes only when you understand your relationships, your daily activities, the way you are acting, the way you are thinking, the way you are talking, your attitude to your neighbour, to your wife, to your husband, to your children. Without understanding yourself, whatever you do, however far you may escape, will only produce more misery, more wars, more destruction.

Question : Prayer is the only expression of every human heart, it is the cry of the heart for unity. All schools of Bhaktimarga are based on the instinctive bent for devotion. Why do you brush it aside as a thing of the mind ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Most people pray, you all do, either in a temple, in your private room, or quietly in your own heart. When do you pray ? Surely, you pray when you are in trouble.

do you not ? When you are faced with a serious problem, when you are in sorrow, when there is no one to help you in your difficulty, when you are unhappy, confused, disturbed, and you want someone to help you out—then you pray. That is, prayer is the cry of every human being who seeks someone to help him out of his misery; so prayer is generally a petition, is it not ? It is a supplication to someone outside of yourself, to a separate entity, to help you, and you want to be united with that entity.

Now, Sirs, most of you pray in one way or another, so try to understand what I am talking about; do not resist it, but first find out. I am not mesmerizing you, I am trying to tell you that to resist something new is not to understand it. Do not say that I am condemning prayer, that I think it is futile; because there may be a different approach to the whole problem. Unless you follow this rather closely, I am afraid you won't understand what is going to come out of it. Prayer is a supplication, a petition, an appeal to something outside of ourselves. Is there anything beyond ourselves ? Do not quote the *Upanishads* or Marx, because quotation has no meaning. The *Upanishads* may say that there is something beyond yourself, and the Marxist may say there is nothing beyond yourself, but both of them may be wrong. You have to find out the truth of it, and to find out the truth of it you have to examine the process of yourself in prayer, you have to understand why you pray. For the moment we are not considering whether there is an answer to prayer, or how the answer comes; we will go into that presently. When you pray, it is taken for granted that you pray to another, to an entity who is superior; who is beyond yourself; but before we go into that, surely we must find out why you pray.

What is the process of prayer ? First, obviously, we pray because we are confused. A happy man does not pray, does he ? A man with joy, with delight, does not pray. It is the man who is in sorrow, the man who is faced with a difficulty, who is in confusion, in pain—it is he who prays ; and his prayer is either for the clarification of his confusion, or it is a supplication for some other need in which there is urgency. So, the man who prays is confused, in misery, in travail ; and what happens when he prays ? Have you ever observed yourself praying ? You either kneel or sit quietly, you take a certain physical posture, don't you ? Or, while you are walking, your mind is praying. Now, what happens in that process ? Please follow it and you will see. When you pray your mind is repeating certain words, certain Christian or Sanskrit phrases ; and the repetition of these phrases makes the mind quiet, does it not ? Try it and you will see that if you keep on repeating certain words, certain phrases, the superficial, upper layers of the mind are made quiet—which is not real stillness, but a form of hypnosis. Now, when the upper, the superficial mind is made quiet, what happens ? Obviously, the deeper layers of the mind give their intimation, do they not ? All the deeper levels of consciousness, the racial accumulations, the individual experiences, the past memories and knowledge—it is all there ; but our daily life, our daily activities, are merely on the surface of the mind, and most of us are not concerned at all about the deeper levels. We are concerned with them only when we are disturbed, or occasionally when there is a remembrance, a dream. But obviously the deeper layers of consciousness are always there, and they are ceaselessly acting, waiting, watching ; and when the superficial mind, which is ordinarily so completely occupied

with its own troubles, necessities, and worries, becomes somewhat quiet, or is made quiet, naturally the inward memories give their intimations ; and these intimations we call the Voice of God. But is it the Voice of God ? Is it something beyond yourself ? When these intimations come obviously they must be the result of collective and individual experience, of racial memory, which is a little more alert, a little wiser than the superficial mind ; but the response is still from yourself, it is not from outside. The collective memories, the collective instincts, the collective idiosyncrasies and responses—all these project the hint into the quiet mind, but it is still from the limited entity, from the conditioned consciousness, it is not from beyond that consciousness. That is how your prayers are answered. You are part of the collective, and your prayers are answered from the collective in yourself ; and the response to prayer must be satisfactory to the conscious mind, otherwise you will never accept it. You believe and you pray because you want a way out of your difficulty ; and the way out of your difficulty is always satisfying, somehow your prayers are always answered according to your gratifications. So, our prayers, which are supplications, have an answer from our deeper selves, not from beyond ourselves.

The next question is : is there something beyond ourselves ? To find that out requires quite a different way of thinking, not through prayer, not through meditation, not through quotation, but through understanding the whole process of consciousness. The mind can project ideas about God or reality, but what the mind projects is not beyond the field of thought ; and as long as the mind is active in the projection of its own conceptions, it obviously cannot find out if there is something

beyond itself. To find out if there is something beyond itself, the mind must cease to project, because whatever it can think of is still within the field of thought, whether conscious or unconscious. What the mind can project is not outside the field of itself, and to find out if there is something beyond the mind, the mind as thought must come to an end. Any activity, any movement on the part of the mind, is still its own projection, and as long as thought continues, it can never find what is beyond itself. That which is beyond the mind can be discovered only when the mind is still; and the stilling of the mind is not a process of will, of determined action. The mind that is made still through the action of will is obviously not a still mind, so the problem is how thought can come to an end without willing it to come to an end; because, if I discipline the mind to be still, then it is a dead mind, it is an enclosed mind, it is not a free mind. It is only the free mind that can discover what is beyond itself, and that freedom cannot be imposed on the mind. Imposition is not freedom, discipline is not freedom, conformity is not freedom; but when the mind sees that conformity is not freedom, then it is free. Seeing the fact is the beginning of freedom, which is seeing the false as the false and the true as the true, not at a distant future, but from moment to moment; then only is there that freedom in which the mind can be simple and still, and such a still mind can know what is beyond itself.

Question : Do you accept the law of reincarnation and karma as valid, or do you envisage a state of complete annihilation ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Now, most of you probably believe in reincarnation and karma, so please do not resist what

I am going to say. Through resistance we do not understand, through exclusion there is no communion; to understand something, we must love it, which means we must be in communion with it and not be afraid of it.

First of all, belief in any form is the denial of truth; a believing mind is not an exploring mind, a believing mind can never be in a state of experiencing. Belief is merely a tether created by a particular desire. A man who believes in reincarnation cannot know the truth of it, because his belief is merely a comfort, an escape from death, from the fear of non-continuity; such a man cannot find the truth of reincarnation, because what he wants is comfort, not truth. Truth may give him comfort or it may be a disturbing factor; but if he starts with the desire to find comfort, he cannot see the truth. Now, if you are serious, you and I are going to find out the truth of the matter, and what is important is how we approach the problem. How do you and I approach the problem of reincarnation? Are you approaching it through fear, through curiosity, through the desire for continuity? Or, do you want to know what is? I am not avoiding the question. A mind that wants to know the truth, whatever it is, is surely in a different state from the mind which is afraid of death and is seeking comfort, continuity, and therefore clings to reincarnation. Such a mind is obviously not in a state of discovery. So, the approach to the problem matters; and I am taking it for granted that you are approaching the problem rightly, not through any desire for comfort, but to find out the truth of the matter.

Now, what do you mean by reincarnation? What is it that reincarnates? You know there is death, and do what you will, you cannot avoid it. You may postpone

death, but this is a fact, which we will go into presently. What is it that reincarnates? It is either one of two things, is it not? Either it is a spiritual entity, or it is a thing which is merely an accumulation of experience, of knowledge, of memory, not only individual but collective, which takes form again in another life. So, let us examine those two things. What do we mean by a 'spiritual entity'? Is there a spiritual entity in you, something which is not of the mind, which is beyond sensation, something which is not of time, something immortal? You will say, 'Yes'—all religious people do. You say that there is a spiritual entity which is beyond time, beyond the mind, beyond death. Please do not resist, let us think it out. If you say there is a spiritual entity in you, it is obviously the product of thought, is it not? You have been told about it, it is not your experience. As a man is conditioned by being brought up with the idea that there is no spiritual entity, but only the coming together of various social, economic and environmental influences, so you are conditioned to the idea of a spiritual entity, are you not? Even if it is your own discovery that there is a spiritual entity, surely it is still within the field of thought; and thought is the result of time, thought is the product of the past, thought is accumulation, memory. That is, if you can think about the spiritual entity, surely that entity is still within the field of thought, therefore it is the product of thought, the projection of thought; and therefore it is not a spiritual entity. What you can think about is still within the field of thought, so it cannot be something beyond thought.

Now, if there is no spiritual entity, then what is it that reincarnates? And if there is a spiritual entity, can it reincarnate? Is it a thing of time, is it a thing of memory that comes

and goes at your convenience, at your desire? If it is born, if it is a process in time, if it has progress, surely it is not a spiritual entity; and if it is not of time, then there can be no question of reincarnating, taking on a new life. So, if the spiritual entity is not, then the 'you' is merely a bundle of accumulated memories, the 'you' is your property, your wife, your husband, your children, your name, your qualities. The accumulation of the experiences of the past in conjunction with the present is the 'you', both the conscious and the unconscious, the collective as well as the individual—that whole bundle is the 'you'; and that bundle asks, 'Shall I reincarnate, shall I have continuity, what happens after death?' If there is a spiritual entity, it is beyond thought, it cannot be caught in the net of the mind; and to discover that entity, that spiritual state, the mind must be quiet, it cannot be agitated with the functioning of thought. Now you are asking whether the 'you' has continuity—the 'you' being the name, the property, the furniture, the memories, the idiosyncrasies, the experiences, the accumulated knowledge. Has that continuity? That is, has conditioned thought a continuity? Obviously, thought has continuity, for that you do not have to enquire far. You have continuity in your children, in your property, in your name; obviously, that continues in one form or another. But you are not satisfied with that continuity, are you? You want to continue as a spiritual entity, not merely as thought, a bundle of reactions—there is no fun in that. But are you anything more than that? Are you anything more than your religion, your beliefs, your caste divisions, your superstitions, traditions and future hopes? Are you anything more than that? You would think you are more than :

the fact is you are that and nothing else. There may be something beyond; but to discover something beyond, all this has to come to an end. So, when you enquire into the problem of reincarnation, you are concerned, not with what is beyond, but with the continuity of thought identified as the 'you'; and obviously, there is continuity.

Now, another question involved in this is the problem of death. What is death? Is death merely the ending of the body? And why is it that we are so afraid of death? Because we cling to continuity and we see that there is an ending of continuity when we die, we want assurance of continuity on the other side, and that is why we believe in life after death; but any amount of guarantees of continuity, all the research societies, all the books and information, will never satisfy you. Death is always the unknown; you may have all the information about it, but the known is afraid of the unknown, and will always be. So, one of the problems in this question is this: Is continuity creative? Can that which is continuous discover anything beyond itself? Sir, can that which has continuity know something beyond its own field? That is the problem, and it is a problem which you are unwilling to face—and that is why you are afraid of death. That which continues can never be creative; it is only in ending that there is the new. Only when the known comes to an end is there creation, the new, the unknown; but as long as we cling to the desire for continuity, which is thought identified as the 'me', that thought will continue, and that which continues has in it the seed of death and decay, it is not creative. It is only that which ends that can see the new, the fresh, the whole, the unknown. Sir, this is simple and very clear. As long as you are continuing in the habit of a particular thought,

surely you cannot know the new, can you? As long as you cling to your traditions, to your name, to your properties, you cannot know anything new, can you? It is only when you let all that go completely that the new comes. But you dare not let go of the old because you are afraid of the new; that is why you are afraid of death, and that is why you have all the innumerable escapes. More books are written on death than on life, because life you want to avoid. Living is to you a continuity, and that which continues withers, has no life; it is always afraid of coming to an end—and that is why you want immortality. You have your immortality in your name, in your property, in your furniture, in your son, your clothes, your house; all that is your immortality—you have it, but you want something more. You want immortality on the other side—and you have that too, which is your thought, identified as yourself, continuing; 'yourself' being your furniture, your hats, your substitutions, your beliefs. But should you not find out whether that which continues can ever know the timeless? That which continues implies a process of time, the past, the present and the future. That is, continuance is the past in conjunction with the present breeding the tomorrow, the future, which again breeds another future; and so there is continuity. But does that continuity bring about, can that continuity discover the unknown, the unknowable, the eternal? And if it cannot, what is the point of having that thought, identified as the 'me', continue? The 'me', which is identified thought, must be in a state of ceaseless conflict, constant suffering, perpetual worry over problems, and so on; and that is the lot of continuity. It is only when the mind comes to an end, when it is not identified as the 'me', that you will know that which is beyond time; but

merely to speculate what is beyond is a waste of energy, it is the action of a sluggard. So, that which has continuance can never know the real, but that which has an ending shall know the real. Death alone can show the way to reality—not the death of old age or of disease, but the death of every day, dying every minute, so that you see the new.

In this question is also involved the problem of karma. I wonder if you would rather I discussed this another time? It is already half past seven. Do you want me to go into it?

Comment from the Audience:
Yes, Sir.

KRISHNAMURTI: Have you understood what I have said about reincarnation? Have you, Sirs? Why this strange silence? (Interruption.) This is not a discussion, Sir. We will discuss next Tuesday the question of time, and on Thursday evening we will discuss meditation; but if you really think about what has just been said, you will see the extraordinary depth of ending, of dying. The mind that can die every minute shall know the eternal; but the mind that has continuance can never know that which is beyond the mind. Sir, that is not a thing to be quoted, discussed; you must live it, and then only you will know the beauty of it, you will know the depth and the significance of dying each minute. Dying is merely the ending of the past, which is memory—not the memory, the recognition of facts, but the ending of the psychological accumulation as the 'me' and the 'mine'; and in that ending of identified thought, there is the new.

Now you want me to answer the question on karma. Please approach it with freedom, not with resistance, not with superstition, not with your beliefs. Obviously, there is cause and

effect. The mind is the result of a cause, you are the result, the product of yesterday, and of many, many thousands of yesterdays; cause and effect are an obvious fact. The seedling has in it both cause and effect. It is specialized; a particular seed cannot become something different. The seed of wheat is specialized, but we human beings are different, are we not? That which specializes can be destroyed, anything that specializes comes to an end, biologically as well as psychologically; but with us it is different, is it not? We see that cause becomes effect, and what was effect becomes a further cause—it is very simple. Today is the result of yesterday, and tomorrow is the result of today; yesterday was the cause of today, and today is the cause of tomorrow. What was effect becomes cause, so it is a process without an end. There is no cause apart from effect, there is no division between cause and effect, because cause and effect flow into each other; and if one can see the process of cause and effect as it actually operates, one can be free of it. As long as we are concerned with the mere reconciliation of effects, cause takes patterns, and the patterns then become the issue, the motive of action; but is there at any time a line of demarcation where cause ends and effect begins? Surely not, because cause and effect are in constant movement. In fact, there is no cause and no effect, but only a movement of the 'what has been' through the present to the future; and for a mind that is caught in this process of the 'what has been' using the present as a passage to the 'what will be', there is only a result. That is, such a mind is only concerned with results, with the reconciliation of effects, and hence for such a mind there is no escape beyond its own projections. So, as long as thought is caught in the process of cause and

effect, the mind can proceed only in its own enclosure, and therefore there is no freedom. There is freedom only when we see that the process of cause and effect is not stationary, static, but in movement; when understood, that movement comes to an end—and then one can go beyond.

So, as long as the mind is merely responding to stimuli from the past, whatever it does is merely furthering its own misery; but when it sees and understands the fact of this whole process of cause and effect, of this whole process of time, that very understanding of the fact is freedom from the fact. Then only can the mind know that which is not a result or a cause. Truth is not a result, truth is not a cause, it is something which has no cause at all. That which has a cause is of the mind, that which has an effect is of the mind; and to know the causeless, the eternal, that which is beyond time, the mind, which is the effect of time, must come to an end. Thought, which is the effect as well as the cause, must come to an end, and only then can that which is beyond time be known.

March 5, 1950

V

TALK IN BOMBAY

This is the last talk that will be held here. I believe there is a talk on Tuesday the 14th at Dadar at 9 o'clock; probably you are already informed about it.

I think it is important, is it not?, to understand the meaning of words, not only superficially, according to the dictionary, but also to see their significance beyond the mere superficial level; because, we are mesmerized by words, and we think that by understanding a word we understand the whole content of that word. The word becomes signifi-

cant only when we go beyond the superficial level, the ordinary or common usage, and see the deeper meaning of it. We have been mesmerized by certain words like 'God', 'love', 'the simple life'; and, especially in these times when there is so much confusion, when there are so many leaders, books, theories and opinions, we tend to be easily mesmerized by the word 'activity' or 'action'. So, I think it would be worth-while to go into the problem of what we mean by action, and not merely be hypnotized by that word. We think we are very much alive and active when we keep going, when we are constantly in movement, when we are doing something, either at the club, in politics, in the family, or what you will. We think activity is life; and is it life? Living in the mechanical responses of everyday existence—is that life? Since mere activity takes most of our energy, is it not important to understand and not be mesmerized by the words 'action' and 'activity'? Action is obviously necessary, action is life; but at what level? We act according to opinion, according to memory, we are a whole series of conditioned responses, memories and traditions. Our action and our morality are based on what has been or what will be, and our thinking, which is obviously the basis of our action, is almost mechanical; most of us are like machines in what we do. You give a machine certain information, and it gives you certain responses; similarly, we receive certain information through our senscs, and then respond. So, our thinking and our activities are almost mechanical, and this mechanical thinking with its responses and activity we call 'living'. We are satisfied to live on that level, and we are mesmerized by our leaders, by ourselves, by our environmental influences, to continue living in that state.

Now, can we go beyond and find out what is action? To most of us action is mere mechanical response to a challenge. I ask you something, and you reply. There is constant impingement of stimuli, and there is a constant response, conscious or unconscious; and this process of the background, the tradition of what has been, mechanically responding to challenge, to stimuli, is our whole existence, it is our thinking and our activity. Religiously as well as politically, we are always responding to a challenge, and that response we call activity. But is that response, action? Can it ever be action? Surely, it is not action, it is only reaction; and is it possible to go beyond reaction, to go beyond the mechanical process of the mind? We know the structure of the mind, which is merely accumulated information, accumulated experience, the conditioning of the past; and this conditioned mind is always responding, reacting, and this reaction we call action. But action based on reaction must obviously lead to confusion, because there is no newness, there is no freshness, no vitality, no clarity; it is a mechanical response. It is like a motorcar: you put in oil and fuel, start it, keep it going, and occasionally overhaul it. That is exactly what our life is: a series of mechanical responses to stimuli, to challenge, and this we call living. Obviously, such an approach to any problem can solve it only according to reaction, and a problem that is solved according to reaction is not solved at all.

So, is it possible to go beyond the mechanical responses, and find out what is action? Action is obviously not a response, not a reaction; and it is only when we see that action itself is challenge, that there is a quality of newness. To come to that, one must understand the whole process of thinking, the whole process

of responding, reacting; and that is why it is so important to understand oneself. The self is obviously reaction, and to go beyond reaction, there must be complete understanding of the self, of the 'me', on all levels, not only on the physical, but also on the psychological. As long as there is reaction, there must be the self, and the understanding of the self is the ending of reaction. Thinking in terms of reaction with regard to any problem will only multiply the problems, the complexities, the miseries of life; and the ending of reaction, of response, is the understanding of the self, the 'me'. The 'me' is at all levels; it is still the 'me', whether you place it at the highest level, calling it the Atman, the Paramatman or soul, or whether it is the 'me' that owns property, that is seeking power, virtue. The 'me' is merely reaction, and therefore the ending of reaction is the ending of the self. That is why it is important to understand the whole process of the self, which means, obviously the process of thinking. Because our thinking is based on reaction, it is mechanical. The self is mechanical, and therefore it can respond mechanically; and to go beyond, there must be complete self-knowledge. The self is reaction, and when there is the understanding of the self, then we will find out what is action, because then action is challenge, then action is not a response, a reaction, it is from the centre which is without a point. Now we always act from a centre with a point, which is the 'me'—my fears, my hopes, my frustrations, my ambitions, my socio-psychological, environmental or religious conditioning; that is the centre from which we react, and as long as that centre is not completely understood, however much we may try to solve our problems, they will only multiply, and the misery, the struggle, the catastrophe, will only increase. To

understand that centre with a point is to put an end to reaction and to bring about a centre without a point; and when there is that centre without a point, then there is action, and action is itself challenge.

The understanding of the mind is possible only in relationship, in your relationship to property, to people, and to ideas. At present that relationship is reaction, and a problem that is created by reaction cannot be solved by another reaction; it can be solved only when the whole process of reaction is understood, which is the self, the 'me'. Then you will find there is an action which is not reaction, which is the challenge itself, which is creative; but that state is not realized by closing your eyes and going into deep, peculiar meditation, fancies, and what not. Therefore, religion is self-knowledge, the beginning of the understanding of reaction; and without self-knowledge, there is no basis for thinking, there is only a basis for reaction. The process of reaction is not thinking. Thinking is action without a centre—but then it is no longer thinking, because then there is no verbalization, there is no accumulation of memory, of experience. We can solve our problems only when we approach them anew, when there is creativeness, and there can be no creativeness if there is mechanical response. A machine is not creative, however marvellously put together; and we have a mind which is marvellously put together, which is mechanical, and which creates problems. To resolve those problems, occasionally we give it a shock, and then more and more shocks; but the shock method is not the solution of a problem. The solution of problems comes only when there is action which is not a reaction, and that is possible only when we understand the whole process of the mind in its relationships in daily life.

So, religion is the understanding of daily life, not a theory or a process of isolation. A religious man who repeats certain words while ruthlessly exploiting others is obviously an escapist; his morality, his respectability, is without any meaning. The understanding of the self is the beginning of wisdom, and wisdom is not reaction. It is only when the whole process of reaction, which is conditioning, is understood, that there is a centre without a point, which is wisdom.

Apparently it is easy to ask questions, for many have been sent in. Out of all those questions, résumés have been made of the more representative ones, and here they are; so if your particular question is not answered exactly as you put it, it is only being answered differently, but the problems are the same. As I answer these questions please do not merely follow on the verbal level what is being said, but experience it as we go along. Let us take the journey together and observe, as it were, every shadow, every flower, every stone, every dead animal on the road, all the dirt and beauty that lie along the wayside. That is the only way we can solve any of our problems: by clearly, definitely and closely observing everything that we see and feel.

Question: Will you please explain the process of your mind when you are actually speaking here. If you have not gathered knowledge, and if you have no store of experience and memory, from where do you get your wisdom? How do you manage to cultivate it? (Pause.)

KRISHNAMURTI: I am hesitating because I have not seen the questions before. I shall answer spontaneously, so you also will have to follow spontaneously and not think

along traditional lines. The question, then, is how my mind works, and how I have gathered wisdom. "If you have no store of experience and memory, from where do you get your wisdom? How do you manage to cultivate it?" First of all, how do you know that what I am saying is wisdom? (Laughter.) Sirs, do not laugh. It is easy to laugh and pass it by. How do you know that what I am saying is true? By what measurement, by what yardstick do you measure? Is there a measurement for wisdom? Can you say this is wisdom and that is not? Is sensation wisdom, or is the response to sensation wisdom? Sir, you do not know what wisdom is, therefore you cannot say I am speaking wisdom. Wisdom is not that which you experience, nor is it to be found in a book. Wisdom is not something that you can experience at all, that you can gather, accumulate. On the contrary, wisdom is a state of being in which there is no accumulation of any kind, you cannot gather wisdom.

The questioner wants to know how my mind works. If I may go into it a little, I will show you. There is no centre from which it is acting, there is no memory from which it is responding. There is memory of the road which I took just now, of the road where I live, there is the recognition of people, of incidents; but there is no accumulating process, no mechanical process of gradual gathering, from which comes response. If I did not know the usage of English or some other language, I would not be able to speak. Communication on the verbal level is necessary in order to understand each other; but it is what is said, how it is said, from where it is said, that is important. Now, when a question is put, if the answer is the response of a mind which has accumulated experiences and memories, then it is merely reaction, and there-

fore it is not reasoning; but when there is no accumulation, which means no response, then there is no frustration, no effort, no struggle. The accumulating process, the accumulating centre, is like a deep-rooted tree in a stream which gathers debris around itself; and thought, sitting on the top of that tree, imagines it is thinking, living. Such a mind is only accumulating, and the mind which accumulates, whether knowledge, money, or experience, is obviously not living. It is only when the mind moves, flows, that there is living.

The questioner wants to know how wisdom is come by, and how to cultivate it. You cannot cultivate wisdom; you can cultivate knowledge, information, but you cannot cultivate wisdom, because wisdom is not a thing that can be accumulated. The moment you begin to accumulate, it becomes mere information, knowledge, which is not wisdom. The entity that cultivates wisdom is still part of thought, and thought is merely a response, a reaction to challenge. Therefore, thought is merely the accumulation of memory, of experience, of knowledge, and so thought can never find wisdom. Only when there is a cessation of thinking is there wisdom; and there can be cessation of thinking only when there is an end to the process of accumulation—which is the recognition of the 'me' and the 'mine'. While the mind functions within the field of the 'me' and the 'mine', which is merely reaction, there cannot be wisdom. Wisdom is a state of spontaneity which has no centre, which has no accumulating entity. As I am talking I am aware of the words I am using, but I am not reacting from a centre to the question. To find out the truth of a question, of a problem, the process of thinking, which is mechanical and which we know, must come " "

end. Therefore, it means there must be complete inward silence, and then only will you know that creativeness which is not mechanical, which is not merely reaction. So, silence is the beginning of wisdom.

Look, Sirs, it is fairly simple. When you have a problem, your first response is to think about it, to resist it, to deny it, to accept it, or to explain it away, is it not? Watch yourself and you will see. Take any problem that arises, and you will see that the immediate response is to resist or to accept it; or, if you do not do either of those things, you justify it, or you explain it away. So, when a question is asked, your mind is immediately set into motion; like a machine, it immediately responds. But if you will solve the problem, the immediate response is silence, not thinking. When this question was asked, my response was silence, complete silence; and being silent, I saw immediately that where there is accumulation there cannot be wisdom. Wisdom is spontaneity, and there can be no spontaneity or freedom as long as there is accumulation as knowledge, memory. So, a man of experience can never be a wise man, nor a simple man; but the man who is free from the process of accumulation is wise, he knows what silence is; and whatever comes from that silence is true. That silence is not a thing to be cultivated; it has no means, there is no path to it, there is no 'how'. To ask 'how' means cultivating, it is merely a reaction, a response of the desire to accumulate silence. But when you understand the whole process of accumulating, which is process of thinking, then you know that silence from which springs action which is not reaction; a one can live in that silence all the time, it is not a gift it has nothing to do it comes into being you

closely observe every reaction, every thought, every feeling, when you are aware of the fact without explanation, without resistance, without acceptance or justification; and when you see the fact very clearly without intervening blocks and screens, then the very perception of the fact dissolves the fact, and the mind is quiet. It is only when the mind is very quiet, not making an effort to be quiet, that it is free. Sir, it is only the free mind that is wise, and to be free the mind must be silent.

Question: How can I as an individual meet, overcome and resolve the growing tension and war-fever between India and Pakistan? This situation creates a mentality of revenge and mass retaliation. Appeals and arguments are completely inadequate. Inaction is a crime. How does one meet a problem like this?

KRISHNAMURTI: Sir, why do you call inaction a crime? There are only two ways of dealing with this, according to you, which is either to become a pacifist or to take a gun. That is the only way you respond, is it not? That is the only way most people know in which to answer a problem of this kind. To you, the gun and pacifism are the only means of action, are they not? You think you are answering the challenge when you take revenge with a gun, or whatever it is you do; and if you think that violence is no solution, you become a pacifist. In other words, you satisfy your desire for security by becoming a 'pacifist', or by labelling of yourself as a 'pacifist'. You think that you are solving the problem.

a crime from those two points of view. A man who does not carry a gun or call himself a pacifist is to you a criminal, because you think according to the recognized labels, according to those two ways. Now, seeing that, let us find out if inaction is a crime—inaction being not to act along either of those two lines or their equivalents. Is that a crime? Is it a crime to say, 'I am neither a pacifist, nor do I carry a gun'? When would you say that? When you see that both are merely reactions to the challenge, and that through reaction you cannot solve the problem. Surely, the man who carries a gun is doing so because of his reaction, which is the outcome of his conditioning as a nationalist, as an Indian, as a Pakistani, or whatever he is called. The carrying of the gun is merely a reaction according to his conditioning. And the man who does not carry a gun, who calls himself a pacifist, is also reacting according to his particular view, is he not? Those are the two reactions which we know, with which we are all acquainted. During wartime you make the pacifist a martyr, and so on; but both are recognized means of activity, and when you act along either of those two lines, with all their implications, you are satisfied, you feel that at least you are doing something about the war, and people recognize that you are doing it. You feel satisfied and they feel satisfied; and the more carrying of guns, the better.

Now, the man who in wartime neither carries a gun nor calls himself a pacifist, who is inactive in the deep sense of the word, who does not respond to the challenge as a reaction—such a man you call inactive and therefore criminal. Now, is he the criminal? Is he inactive? Are you not the criminals, both the pacifist and the man who carries a gun? Surely, the criminal is not the man

who says, 'I will not react to war in any way', because such a man has no country, he belongs to no religion, no dogma, he has no leader, political, religious or economic, he does not belong to any party, because these are all reactions; and therefore he is neither a pacifist nor does he carry a gun. And a man who does not react to the challenge, but who is the challenge, such a man you call inactive, a useless entity, because he does not fit into either of these two categories. Surely, the whole thing is wrong, pacifism as well as carrying a gun, because they are mere reactions, and through reaction you will never solve any problem. You will solve the problem of war only when you yourself are the challenge, and not merely a reaction.

So, the man who carries a gun does not solve the problem, he only increases the problem; for each war produces another war, it is an historical fact. The first world war produced the second world war, the second will produce the third, and so the chain keeps going. Now, when you see that, you react against it and say, 'I am a pacifist, I won't carry a gun and I will go to prison, I will suffer for it; I have a cause for which I am acting'. The suffering, the martyrdom, is still a reaction, and so it cannot solve the problem either. But the man who is not reacting to war in any way is the challenge itself, he is in himself the breaker of old traditions, and such a man is the only entity that can resolve this problem. That is why it is important to understand yourself, your conditioning, your upbringing, the way you are educated; because, the government, the whole system, is your own projection. The world is you, the world is not separate from you; the world with its problems is projected out of your responses, out of your reactions, so the solution does not lie in creating further reactions.

There can be a solution only when there is action which is not reaction, and that can come into being only when you understand the whole process of response to stimuli both from outside and inside, which means that you understand the structure of your own being from which society is created.

Question : We know sex as an inescapable physical and psychological necessity, and it seems to be a root-cause of chaos in the personal life of our generation. It is a horror to young women who are victims of man's lust. Suppression and indulgence are equally ineffective. How can we deal with this problem?

KRISHNAMURTI: Why is it that whatever we touch we turn into a problem? We have made God a problem, we have made love a problem, we have made relationship, living a problem, and we have made sex a problem. Why? Why is everything we do a problem, a horror? Why are we suffering? Why has sex become a problem? Why do we submit to living with problems, why do we not put an end to them? Why do we not die to our problems instead of carrying them day after day, year after year? Surely, sex is a relevant question, which I shall answer presently; but there is the primary question, why do we make life into a problem? Working, sex, earning money, thinking, feeling, experiencing, you know, the whole business of living—why is it a problem? Is it not essentially because we always think from a particular point of view, from a fixed point of view? We are always thinking from a centre towards the periphery; but the periphery is the centre for most of us, and so anything we touch is superficial. But life is not superficial, it demands living completely, and be-

cause we are living only superficially, we know only superficial reaction. Whatever we do on the periphery must inevitably create a problem, and that is our life: we live in the superficial and we are content to live there with all the problems of the superficial. So, problems exist as long as we live in the superficial, on the periphery, the periphery being the 'me' and its sensations, which can be externalized or made subjective, which can be identified with the universe, with the country, or with some other thing made up by the mind. So, as long as we live within the field of the mind there must be complications, there must be problems; and that is all we know. Mind is sensation, mind is the result of accumulated sensations and reactions, and anything it touches is bound to create misery, confusion, an endless problem. The mind is the real cause of our problems, the mind that is working mechanically night and day, consciously and unconsciously. The mind is a most superficial thing, and we have spent generations, we spend our whole lives cultivating the mind, making it more and more clever, more and more subtle, more and more cunning, more and more dishonest and crooked, all of which is apparent in every activity of our life. The very nature of our mind is to be dishonest, crooked, incapable of facing facts, and that is the thing which creates problems, that is the thing which is the problem itself.

Now, what do we mean by the problem of sex? Is it the act, or is it a thought about the act? Surely, it is not the act. The sexual act is no problem to you, any more than eating is a problem to you; but if you think about eating or anything else all day long because you have nothing else to think about, it becomes a problem to you. (Laughter.) Do not laugh and look at somebody else, it is your life. So, is the sexual

act the problem, or is it the thought about the act? And why do you think about it? Why do you build it up, which you are obviously doing? The cinemas, the magazines, the stories, the way women dress, everything is building up your thought of sex. And why does the mind build it up, why does the mind think about sex at all? Why, Sirs and Ladies? It is your problem. Why? Why has it become a central issue in your life? When there are so many things calling, demanding your attention, you give complete attention to the thought of sex. What happens, why are your minds so occupied with it? Because that is a way of ultimate escape, is it not? It is a way of complete self-forgetfulness. For the time being, at least for that moment, you can forget yourself—and there is no other way of forgetting yourself. Everything else you do in life gives emphasis to the 'me', to the self. Your business, your religion, your gods, your leaders, your political and economic actions, your escapes, your social activities, your joining one party and rejecting another—all that is emphasizing and giving strength to the 'me'. That is, Sirs, there is only one act in which there is no emphasis on the 'me', so it becomes a problem, does it not? When there is only one thing in your life which is an avenue to ultimate escape, to complete forgetfulness of yourself if only for a few seconds, you cling to it because that is the only moment you are happy. Every other issue you touch becomes a nightmare, a source of suffering and pain, so you cling to the one thing that gives complete self-forgetfulness, which you call happiness. But when you cling to it, it too becomes a nightmare, because then you want to be free from it, you do not want to be a slave to it. So you invent, again from the mind, the idea of chastity, of celibacy, and you try

to be celibate, to be chaste, through suppression, denial, meditation, through all kinds of religious practices, all of which are operations of the mind to cut itself off from the fact. This again gives particular emphasis to the 'me', who is trying to become something, so again you are caught in travail, in trouble, in effort, in pain.

So, sex becomes an extraordinarily difficult and complex problem as long as you do not understand the mind which thinks about the problem. The act itself can never be a problem, but the thought about the act creates the problem. The act you safeguard, you live loosely or indulge yourself in marriage, thereby making your wife into a prostitute, which is all apparently very respectable; and you are satisfied to leave it at that. Surely, the problem can be solved only when you understand the whole process and structure of the 'me' and the 'mine': my wife, my child, my property, my car, my achievement, my success; and until you understand and resolve all that, sex as a problem will remain. As long as you are ambitious, politically, religiously, or in any way, as long as you are emphasizing the self, the thinker, the experiencer, by feeding him on ambition whether in the name of yourself as an individual, or in the name of the country, of the party, or of an idea which you call religion—as long as there is this activity of self-expansion, you will have a sexual problem. Surely, you are creating, feeding, expanding yourself on the one hand, and on the other you are trying to forget yourself, to lose yourself if only for a moment. How can the two exist together? So, your life is a contradiction; emphasis on the 'me', and forgetting the 'me'. Sex is not a problem, the problem is this contradiction in your life; and the contradiction cannot be bridged over by

the mind, because the mind itself is a contradiction. The contradiction can be understood only when you understand fully the whole process of your daily existence. Going to the cinemas and watching women on the screen, reading books which stimulate the thought, the magazines with their half-naked pictures, your way of looking at women, the surreptitious eyes that catch you—all these things are encouraging the mind through devious ways to emphasize the self; and at the same time you try to be kind, loving, tender. The two cannot go together. The man who is ambitious, spiritually or otherwise, can never be without a problem, because problems cease only when the self is forgotten, when the 'me' is non-existent; and that state of the non-existence of the self is not an act of will, it is not a mere reaction. Sex becomes a reaction; and when the mind tries to solve the problem, it only makes the problem more confused, more troublesome, more painful. So, the act is not the problem, but the mind is the problem, the mind which says it must be chaste. Chastity is not of the mind. The mind can only suppress its own activities, and suppression is not chastity. Chastity is not a virtue, chastity cannot be cultivated. The man who is cultivating humility is surely not a humble man; he may call his pride humility, but he is a proud man, and that is why he seeks to become humble. Pride can never become humble, and chastity is not a thing of the mind—you cannot become chaste. You will know chastity only when there is love, and love is not of the mind nor a thing of the mind.

So, the problem of sex which tortures so many people all over the world cannot be resolved till the mind is understood. We cannot put an end to thinking; but thought comes to an end when the thinker

ceases, and the thinker ceases only when there is an understanding of the whole process. Fear comes into being when there is division between the thinker and his thought; when there is no thinker, then only is there no conflict in thought. What is implicit needs no effort to understand. The thinker comes into being through thought; then the thinker exerts himself to shape, to control his thoughts, or to put an end to them. The thinker is a fictitious entity, an illusion of the mind. When there is a realization of thought as a fact, then there is no need to think about the fact. If there is simple, choiceless awareness, then that which is implicit in the fact begins to reveal itself. Therefore, thought as fact ends. Then you will see that the problems which are eating at our hearts and minds, the problems of our social structure, can be resolved. Then sex is no longer a problem, it has its proper place, it is neither an impure thing nor a pure thing. Sex has its place, but when the mind gives it the predominant place, then it becomes a problem. The mind gives sex a predominant place because it cannot live without some happiness, and so sex becomes a problem; but when the mind understands its whole process and so comes to an end, that is, when thinking ceases, then there is creation, and it is that creation which makes us happy. To be in that state of creation is bliss, because it is self-forgetfulness in which there is no reaction as from the self. This is not an abstract answer to the daily problem of sex—it is the only answer. The mind denies love, and without love there is no chastity; and it is because there is no love that you make sex into a problem.

Question: Love, as we know and experience it, is a fusion between two people, or between the members of

a group ; it is exclusive, and in it there is both pain and joy. When you say love is the only solvent of life's problems, you are giving a connotation to the word which we have hardly experienced. Can a common man like me ever know love in your sense ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Sir, everybody can know love ; but you can know it only when you are capable of looking at facts very clearly, without resistance, without justification, without explaining them away—just look at things closely, observe them very clearly and minutely. Now, what is the thing that we call love ? The questioner says that it is exclusive, and that in it we know pain and joy. Is love exclusive ? We shall find out when we examine what we call love, what the socalled common man calls love. There is no common man. There is only man, which is you and I. The common man is fictitious entity invented by the politicians. There is only man, which you and I who are in sorrow, in pain, in anxiety and fear. Now, what is our life ? To find out what love is, let us begin with what we know. What is our love ? In the midst of pain and pleasure we know it is exclusive, personal : my wife, my children, my country, my God. We know it as a flame in the midst of smoke, we know it through jealousy, we know it through domination, we know it through possession, we know it through loss, when the other is one. So, we know love as sensation, do we not ? When we say we love, we know jealousy, we know fear, we know anxiety. When you say you love someone, all that is implied : envy, the desire to possess, the desire to own, to dominate, the fear of loss, and so on. All this we all love, and we do not know love without fear, without envy, without possession ; we merely verbalize that

state of love which is without fear, we call it impersonal, pure, divine, or God knows what else ; but the fact is that we are jealous, we are dominating, possessive. We shall know that state of love only when jealousy, envy, possessiveness, domination, come to an end ; and as long as we possess, we shall never love. Envy, possession, hatred, the desire to dominate the person or the thing called 'mine', the desire to possess and to be possessed—all that is a process of thought, is it not ? And is love a process of thought ? Is love a thing of the mind ? Actually, for most of us, it is. Do not say it is not—it is nonsense to say that. Do not deny the fact that your love is a thing of the mind. Surely it is, is it not ? Otherwise you would not possess, you would not dominate, you would not say, 'It is mine'. And as you do say it, your love is a thing of the mind ; so love, for you, is a process of thought. You can think about the person whom you love ; but thinking about the person whom you love—is that love ? When do you think about the person whom you love ? You think about her when she is gone, when she is away, when she has left you. But when she no longer disturbs you, when you can say, 'She is mine', then you do not have to think about her. You do not have to think about your furniture, it is part of you—which is a process of identification so as not to be disturbed, to avoid trouble, anxiety, sorrow. So, you miss the person whom you say you love only when you are disturbed, when you are in suffering ; and as long as you possess that person, you do not have to think about that person, because in possession there is no disturbance. But when possession is disturbed, you begin to think, and then you say, 'I love that person'. So your love is merely a reaction of the mind, is it not ?—which means your

love is merely a sensation, and sensation is surely not love. Do you think about the person when you are close to him, Sirs and Ladies? When you possess, hold, dominate, control, when you can say, 'She is mine', or, 'He is mine', there is no problem. As long as you are certain in your possession, there is no problem, is there? And society, everything you have built around you, helps you to possess so as not to be disturbed, so as not to think about it. Thinking comes when you are disturbed—and you are bound to be disturbed as long as your thinking is what you call 'love'. Surely, love is not a thing of the mind; and because the things of the mind have filled our hearts, we have no love. The things of the mind are jealousy, envy, ambition, the desire to be somebody, to achieve success. These things of the mind fill your hearts, and then you say you love; but how can you love when you have all these confusing elements in you? When there is smoke, how can there be a pure flame? Love is not a thing of the mind; and love is the only solution to our problems. Love is not of the mind, and the man who has accumulated money or knowledge can never know love, because he lives with the things of the mind; his activities are of the mind, and whatever he touches he makes into a problem, a confusion, a misery.

So, what we call our love is a thing of the mind. Look at yourselves, Sirs, and Ladies, and you will see that what I am saying is obviously true; otherwise, our lives, our marriage, our relationships, would be entirely different, we would have a new society. We bind ourselves to another, not through fusion, but through contract, which is called love, marriage. Love does not fuse, adjust—it is neither personal nor impersonal, it is a state of being. The man who desires to fuse with something

greater, to unite himself with another, is avoiding misery, confusion; but the mind is still in separation, which is disintegration. Love knows neither fusion nor diffusion, it is neither personal nor impersonal, it is a state of being which the mind cannot find; it can describe it, give it a term, a name, but the word, the description, is not love. It is only when the mind is quiet that it shall know love, and that state of quietness is not a thing to be cultivated. Cultivation is still the action of the mind, discipline is still a product of the mind, and a mind that is disciplined, controlled, subjugated, a mind that is resisting, explaining, cannot know love. You may read, you may listen to what is being said about love, but that is not love. Only when you put away the things of the mind, only when your hearts are empty of the things of the mind, is there love. Then you will know what it is to love without separation, without distance, without time, without fear—and that is not reserved to the few. Love knows no hierarchy, there is only love. There are the many and the one, an exclusiveness, only when you do not love. When you love, Sir, there is neither the 'you' nor the 'me', in that state there is only a flame without smoke.

It is already half past seven, and there is one more question. Do you want me to answer it? You are not tired?

Question: The question of what is truth is an ancient one, and no one has answered it finally. You speak of truth, but we do not see your experiments or efforts to achieve it, as we saw in the lives of people like Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Besant. Your pleasant personality, your disarming smile and soft love, is all that we see. Will you explain why there is such a difference between your life and the lives

of other seekers of truth. Are there two truths?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do you want proof? And by what standard shall truth be judged? There are those who say that effort and experiment are necessary for truth; but is truth to be gotten through effort, through experiment, through trial and error? There are those who struggle and make valiant efforts, who strive spectacularly, either publicly or quietly in caves; and shall they find truth? Is truth a thing to be discovered through effort? Is there a path to truth, your path and my path, the path of the one who makes an effort, and the path of the one who does not? Are there two truths, or has truth many aspects?

Now, this is your problem, it is not my problem; and your problem is this, is it not? You say, 'Certain people—two, or several, or hundreds—have made efforts, have struggled, have sought truth, whereas you do not make an effort, you lead a pleasant, unassuming life'. So, you want to compare, that is, you have a standard, you have the picture of your leaders who have struggled to achieve truth; and when someone else comes along who does not fit into your frame, you are baffled, and so you ask, 'Which is truth?' You are baffled—that is the important thing, Sir, not whether I have truth or someone else has truth. What is important is to find out if you can discover reality through effort, will, struggle, striving. Does that bring understanding? Surely, truth is not something distant, truth is in the little things of everyday life, in every word, in every smile, in every relationship, only we do not know how to see it; and the man who tries, who struggles valiantly, who disciplines himself, controls himself,—will he see truth? The mind that is disciplined, controlled, narrowed down through

effort—shall it see truth? Obviously not. It is only the silent mind that shall see the truth, not the mind that makes an effort to see. Sir, if you are making an effort to hear what I am saying, will you hear? It is only when you are quiet, when you are really silent, that you understand. If you observe closely, listen quietly, then you will hear; but if you strain, struggle to catch everything that is being said, your energy will be dissipated in the strain, in the effort. So, you will not find truth through effort, it does not matter who says it, whether the ancient books, the ancient saints, or the modern ones. Effort is the very denial of understanding; and it is only the quiet mind, the simple mind, the mind that is still, that is not overtaxed by its own efforts—only such a mind shall understand, shall see truth. Truth is not something in the distance, there is no path to it, there is neither your path nor my path; there is no devotional path, there is no path of knowledge or path of action, because truth has no path to it. The moment you have a path to truth, you divide it, because the path is exclusive; and what is exclusive at the very beginning, will end in exclusiveness. The man who is following a path can never know truth because he is living in exclusiveness; his means are exclusive, and the means are the end, the means are not separate from the end. If the means are exclusive, the end is also exclusive.

So, there is no path to truth, and there are not two truths. Truth is not of the past or of the present, it is timeless; and the man who quotes the truth of the Buddha, of Sankara, of the Christ, or who merely repeats what I am saying, will not find truth, because repetition is not truth. Repetition is a lie. Truth is a state of being which arises when the mind—which seeks to divide, to be exclu-

sive, which can think only in terms of results, of achievement—has come to an end. Only then will there be truth. The mind that is making effort, disciplining itself in order to achieve an end, cannot know truth, because the end is its own projection, and the pursuit of that projection, however noble, is a form of self-worship. Such a being is worshiping himself, and therefore he cannot know truth. Truth is to be known only when we understand the whole process of the mind, that is, when there is no strife. Truth is a fact, and the fact can be understood only when the various things that have been placed between the mind and the fact are removed. The fact is your relationship to property, to your wife, to human beings, to nature, to ideas; and as long as you do not understand the fact of relationship, your seeking God merely increases the confusion because it is a substitution, an escape, and therefore it has no meaning. As long as you dominate your wife or she dominates you, as long as you possess and are possessed, you cannot know love; as long as you are suppressing, substituting, as long as you are ambitious, you cannot know truth. It is not the denial of ambition that makes the mind calm, and virtue is not the denial of evil. Virtue is a state of freedom, of order, which evil cannot give; and the understanding of evil is the establishment of virtue. The man who builds churches or temples in the name of God with the money which he has gathered through exploitation, through deceit, through cunning and foul play, shall not know truth; he may be mild of tongue, but his tongue is bitter with the taste of exploitation, the taste of sorrow. He alone shall know truth who is not seeking, who is not striving, who is not trying to achieve a result. The mind itself is a result, and whatever produces is still a result; but the

man who is content with what is shall know truth. Contentment does not mean being satisfied with the status quo, maintaining things as they are—that is not contentment. It is in seeing a fact truly and being free of it, that there is contentment which is virtue. Truth is not continuous, it has no abiding place, it can be seen only from moment to moment. Truth is always new, therefore timeless. What was truth yesterday is not truth today, what is truth today is not truth tomorrow. Truth has no continuity. It is the mind which wants to make the experience which it calls truth continuous, and such a mind shall not know truth. Truth is always new; it is to see the same smile, and see that smile newly, to see the same person, and see that person anew, to see the waving palms anew, to meet life anew. Truth is not to be had through books, through devotion, or through self-immolation, but it is known when the mind is free, quiet; and that freedom, that quietness of the mind comes only when the facts of its relationships are understood. Without understanding its relationships, whatever it does only creates further problems. But when the mind is free from all its projections, there is a state of quietness in which problems cease, and then only the timeless, the eternal comes into being. Then truth is not a matter of knowledge, it is not a thing to be remembered, it is not something to be repeated, to be printed and spread abroad. Truth is that which is, it is nameless and so the mind cannot approach it.

March 12, 1950

VI

TALK IN BOMBAY

This is going to be rather difficult, and I hope those who understand English will have the patience to listen to Marathi.

It must be fairly obvious to most of us that a different kind of thinking and action must be brought about in the world, and that requires very careful observation of ourselves, not mere analysis, but deep penetration into the activities of each one of us. The problems of our daily existence are numerous, and we have not the means or the capacity to deal with them; and as our lives are so drab, dull and stupid, we try to escape from them, either intellectually or mystically. Intellectually we become cynical, clever and very learned, or mystically we try to develop some powers or follow some guru, hoping to make our hearts more lovely and give our life more zest. Or, seeing the drabness of our life and the implication of our problems, and seeing that the problems are always on the increase, always multiplying, we think that to bring about a fundamental change we cannot act as individuals, but must act in a mass, collectively. I think it is a great mistake to say that our problems are to be solved through collective or mass action. We believe that individual action is of very little importance and has no place when the problems are so vast, so complex, so demanding; therefore we turn to collective or mass action. We think that if you and I acted individually, it would have very little result, so we join mass movements and take part in collective action. But if we examine collective action very closely, we will see that it is really based on you and me. We seem to regard mass action as the only effective action because it can produce a result; but we forget that individual action is much more effective, because the mass is composed of many individuals, the mass is not an independent entity, it is not different or separate from you and me.

So, what is important is to understand that any creative, any definitely

effective action can be brought about only by individuals, that is, by you and me. Mass action is really an invention of the politician, is it not? It is a fictitious action in which there is no independent thought and action on the part of the individual. If you look at history, all great movements which resulted in collective action began with individuals like you and me, individuals who are capable of thinking very clearly and seeing things as they are; those individuals, through their understanding, invite others, and then there is collective action. After all, the collective is composed of individuals, and it is only the response of the individual, of you and me, that can bring about a fundamental alteration in the world; but when the individual does not see his responsibility, he throws the responsibility onto the collective, and the collective is then used by the clever politician, or by the clever religious leader. Whereas, if you see that you and I are responsible for the alteration of the conditions in the world, then the individual becomes extraordinarily important, and not merely an instrument, a tool in the hands of another.

So, you, the individual, are part of society, you are not separate from society; what you are, society is. Though society may be an entity apart from you, you have created it, and therefore you alone can change it. But instead of realizing our responsibility as individuals in the collective, we as individuals become cynical, intellectual or mystical, we avoid our responsibility towards definite action - which must be revolutionary in the fundamental sense; and as long as the individual, which is you and I, does not take responsibility for the complete transformation of society, society will remain as it is.

We seem to forget that the world problem is the individual problem, that the problems of the world are

created by you and me as individuals. The problems of war, starvation, exploitation, and all the other innumerable problems that confront each one of us, are created by you and me; and as long as we do not understand ourselves at every level, we will maintain the rottenness of the present society. So, before you can alter society, you have to understand what your whole structure is, the manner of your thinking, the manner of your action, the ways of your relationship with people, ideas and things. Revolution in society must begin with revolution in your own thinking and acting. The understanding of yourself is of primary importance if you would bring about a radical transformation in society; and the understanding of yourself is self-knowledge. Now, we have made self-knowledge into something extraordinarily difficult and remote. Religions have made self-knowledge very mystical, abstract and far away; but if you look at it more closely, you will see that self-knowledge is very simple and demands simple attention in relationship, and it is essential if there is to be a fundamental revolution in the structure of society. If you, the individual, do not understand the ways of your own thought and activities, merely to bring about a superficial revolution in the outer structure of society is to create further confusion and misery. If you do not know yourself, if you follow another without knowing the whole process of your own thinking and feeling, you will obviously be led to further confusion, to further disaster.

After all, life is relationship, and without relationship there is no possibility of life. There is no living in isolation, because living is a process of relationship; and relationship is not with abstractions, it is your relationship to property, to people and to ideas. In relationship you see yourself as you are, whatever you are,

ugly or beautiful, subtle or gross; in the mirror of relationship you see precisely every new problem, the whole structure of yourself as you are. Because you think that you cannot alter your relationship fundamentally, you try to escape intellectually or mystically, and this escape only creates more problems, more confusion and more disaster. But if, instead of escaping, you look at your life in relationship and understand the whole structure of that relationship, then there is a possibility of going beyond that which is very close. Surely, to go very far you must begin very near; but to begin near is very difficult for most of us, because we want to escape from what is, from the fact of what we are. Without understanding ourselves, we cannot go far; and we are in constant relationship, there is no existence at all without relationship. So, relationship is the immediate, and to go beyond the immediate, there must be the understanding of relationship. But we would much rather examine that which is very far away, that which we call God or truth, than bring about a fundamental revolution in our relationship; and this escape to God or to truth is utterly fictitious, unreal. Relationship is the only thing that we have, and without understanding that relationship we can never find out what reality is or God is. So, to bring about a complete change in the social structure, in society, the individual must cleanse his relationship, and the cleansing of relationship is the beginning of his own transformation.

I am going to answer some questions which have been handed to me. Now, in considering these questions, I shall not give any definite conclusion or final answer, because what is important is to find out the truth of the problem; and the truth is not in the answer, but in the problem itself. Most of us are accustomed to repeat

what we have been told, to recite something that we have learnt from a book ; and so, in putting questions, we expect answers which will fit into our particular ways of thinking. We think we understand the problems of life by quoting some sacred book, which merely makes us into gramophone records ; and if the song is not the same, we get lost. The so-called religious person and the so-called non-believer are both repeating machines. They are neither religious nor revolutionary, they merely repeat a formula, and repetition does not make one a religious or a revolutionary person. So, in considering these questions, let us travel together and go into the problem fully and extensively, not merely look at it from outside.

Question : Political freedom has not yet brought a new faith and joy. We find every where cynicism, communal and linguistic antagonism, and class hatred. What is your diagnosis and remedy for this tragic situation ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Sir, this is not a problem only in India, but a problem all over the world. It is a world problem, not merely an Indian problem. Now, one of the factors of disintegration is when people divide themselves into communal, linguistic or sectional groups. We seem to think that through nationalism we shall be able to solve our problems ; but nationalism, however widely extended, is an exclusion, it is still separatism, and where there is separatism there is disintegration. Though full of promise at the beginning, full of hope, joy and expectation, nationalism becomes a poison, as you can see in this country—and that is exactly what is happening in every country. How can there be unity when there is exclusion ? Unity implies no separation into Hindu and

Mussalman. Unity is destroyed when it becomes exclusive, when it is limited to a particular group. Unity is not the opposite of exclusion ; it is the inner integration of the whole being of the individual in himself, not mere identification with a particular group or society. Why are you nationalist, why do you belong to a particular class ? Why this emphasis on a name ? Let us examine this process of identification with a country, with a people, with a linguistic group, and so on. Why is it that you call yourself a Hindu ? Why is it that you call yourself an Indian, a Gujarathi, or by some other name ? Is it not because through identification with something greater, you feel yourself to be greater ? In yourself you are nobody, you are dry, empty, hollow ; and by identifying yourself with something greater called India, England or some other country, you think you become important. So, your calling yourself a nationalist, your identifying yourself with a particular country, obviously indicates that in yourself you are empty, dull, dry, ugly ; and in identifying yourself with something greater you are merely escaping from what you are. Now, such identification must lead to disintegration ; because you as an individual are the basis of all society, and if you are dishonest in your own thinking, the society you produce or project outside of yourself will be founded on dishonesty, without any fundamental reality. And the clever politicians or religious leaders use nationalism as a means of producing a result which is merely artificial, because it is without the understanding of the whole structure of human thought and feeling. We seem to think that by gaining independence we have achieved freedom. Freedom is not achieved, it does not come through mere political . . . Freedom comes when there is ness. By merely exchanging

bureaucracy for a brown bureaucracy you are not free, are you ? You are still the exploiter and the exploited, you are still saddled with the clever politicians and the innumerable leaders who are trying to lead you to God knows what. Nationalism is like a poison that is working subtly—and before you know what is happening, you are in the middle of a war. Sovereign governments with their nationalism and armed forces must lead to war ; and to avoid war is not to become a mere pacifist or to join an anti-war movement, but to understand the whole structure of ourselves as human entities, as individuals in relationship with each other, which is society.

So, to understand yourself is much more important than to call yourself by a name. A name is readily exploited ; but if you understand yourself, no one can exploit you. Nationalism always produces war, and the problem is not to be solved by bringing about further nationalism, which is only an avoidance of the fact and an extension of the same poison, but by being free of nationalism, of the sense of belonging to a particular group, to a particular class or society.

Question : Can the starving and ignorant people of this land understand your message ? How can it have any meaning or significance for them ?

KRISHNAMURTI : The problem of starvation and unemployment is not only in this country, though it is much more aggravated here, but it exists all over the world. It has definite causes, and until we understand those causes merely to scratch on the surface will have no result. Nationalism is one of the causes, separate sovereign governments is another. There is enough scientific knowledge to bring about conditions so that people all over the world can have food,

clothing and shelter. Why is it not done ? Is it not because we are quarrelling over systems ? Realizing that there is starvation and unemployment in the world, we turn to systems and formulae which promise a better future ; and have you ever noticed that those who have a system for the solution of unemployment and starvation are always fighting another system ? So, systems become much more important than the solution of the problem of starvation itself. The fact of starvation can never be solved by an idea, because ideas will only produce more conflict, more opposition ; but facts can never produce opposition. There is starvation and unemployment in this country and throughout the world ; and seeing the problem, we approach it with an idea about the problem. So, idea, theory, system, becomes much more important than the fact. That is, we turn from the fact to a theory, an idea, a belief about the fact, and around the belief groups are being formed, and these groups battle and liquidate each other, and the fact remains. (Laughter.) What is important is the understanding of the fact, not an idea about the fact ; and that understanding does not depend on idea. Idea is merely a fabrication of the mind, but understanding is not a result of the mind. We have enough intelligence and capacity and knowledge to solve the fact of starvation and unemployment ; but what prevents us from solving it is our idea about the solution. The fact is there, and we have created several approaches to the fact : there is the approach of the yogi, of the commissar, of the capitalist, of the socialist, and so on. Now, can the fact be grasped through a particular approach ? A particular approach must obviously prevent the understanding of the fact. So, the fact of starvation and unemployment can be solved only when idea, belief, does not inter-

fere with the understanding of the fact. That means, does it not ?, that you, who are part of society, must be free of nationalism, free of belief in a particular religion, free of identification with a particular idea or group. So, the solution of this problem is not in the hands of the commissar or the yogi, but in your hands, because it is what *you* are that prevents the solution of all these problems. If you are a nationalist, if you belong to a particular class or caste, if you have narrow religious traditions, obviously you are hindering the welfare of man.

Question : Are you not against institutional marriage ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Please listen carefully and hear intelligently, do not merely oppose or resist. It is so easy to be against something, it is so stupid to resist without understanding. Now, the family is exclusive, is it not ? The family is a process of identification with the particular; and when society is based on this idea of family as an exclusive unit in opposition to other exclusive units, such a society must inevitably produce violence. We use family as a means of security for ourselves, for the individual, and where there is search for individual security, for individual happiness, there must be exclusion. This exclusion is called 'love'; and in that so-called family or married state, is there really love ? Now, let us examine what the family actually is, and not cling to a theory about it. We are not considering the ideal of what it should be, but let us examine exactly what the family is as you know it. You mean by family, your wife and children, do you not ? It is a unit in opposition to other units; and in that unit it is *you* who are important—not your wife, not your children or society, but you who are

seeking security, name, position, power, both in the family and outside the family. You dominate your wife, she is subservient to you ; you are the maker and the dispenser of money, and she is your cook and the bearer of your children. (Laughter). So, you create the family which is an exclusive unit in opposition to other units ; you multiply by millions and produce a society in which the family is an exclusive, self-isolating, separative entity, antagonistic and opposed to another. All revolutions try to do away with the family, but invariably they fail because the individual is constantly seeking his own security through isolation, exclusion, ambition and domination. So, the family, which you have created as a separative unit, becomes a danger to the collective, which is also the result of the individual ; therefore there can be no reform in the collective as long as you, the individual, are exclusive and self-isolating in every action, narrowing down your interest to yourself.

Now, this process of exclusion is surely not love. Love is not a creation of the mind. Love is not personal, impersonal, or universal—those words are merely of the mind. Love is something that cannot be understood as long as thought, which is exclusive, remains. Thought, which is the reaction of the mind, can never understand what love is; thought is invariably exclusive, separative, and when thought tries to describe love, it must of necessity enclose it in words which are also exclusive. The family as we know it is the invention of the mind, and therefore it is exclusive, it is a process of the enlargement of the self, of the 'me', which is the result of thought; and in the family to which we cling so constantly, so desperately, surely there is no love, is there ? We use that word 'love', we think we love, but actually we

do not, do we ? We say that we love truth, that we love the wife, the husband, the children ; but that word is surrounded by the smoke of jealousy, envy, oppression, domination and constant battle. So, family becomes a nightmare, it becomes a battle field between the two sexes, and therefore family invariably becomes opposed to society. The solution lies, not in legislation to destroy the family, but in your own understanding of the problem ; and the problem is understood and therefore comes to an end only when there is real love. When the things of the mind do not fill the heart, when individual ambition, personal success and achievement do not predominate, when they have no place in your heart, then you will know love.

Question : Why are you trying to shake our belief in God and religion ? Is not some faith necessary for spiritual endeavour, both individual and collective ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Why do we need faith, why do we need belief ? If you observe, is not belief one of the factors that separate man from man ? You believe in God, and another does not believe in God, so your beliefs separate you from each other. Belief throughout the world is organized as Hinduism, Buddhism, or Christianity, and so it divides man from man. We are confused, and we think that through belief we shall clear the confusion ; that is, belief is superimposed on the confusion, and we hope that confusion will thereby be cleared away. But belief is merely an escape from the fact of confusion ; it does not help us to face and to understand the fact, but to run away from the confusion in which we are. To understand the confusion, belief is not necessary, and belief only acts as a screen between ourselves

and our problems. So, religion which is organized belief, becomes means of escape from what is, from the fact of confusion. The man who believes in God, the man who believes in the hereafter, or who has another form of belief, is escaping from the fact of what he is. Do you know those who believe in God, who do Puja, who repeat certain charms and words, and who in their daily life are dominating, cruel, ambitious, cheating, dishonest ? Shall they find God ? Are they really seeking God ? Is God to be found through repetition of words, through belief ? But such people believe in God, they worship God, they go to the temple every day, they do everything to avoid the facts of what they are—and such people you consider respectable, because they are yourself.

So, your religion, your belief in God, is an escape from actuality, and therefore it is no religion at all. The rich man who accumulates money through cruelty, through dishonesty, through cunning exploitation, believes in God ; and you also believe in God, you also are 'cunning, cruel, suspicious, envious. Is God to be found through dishonesty, through deceit, through cunning tricks of the mind ? Because you collect all the sacred books and the various symbols of God, does that indicate that you are a religious person ? So, religion is not an escape from the fact ; religion is the understanding of the fact of what you are in your everyday relationships. Religion is the manner of your speech, the way you talk, the way you address your servants, the way you treat your wife, your children and neighbours. As long as you do not understand your relationship with your neighbour, with society, with your wife and children, there must be confusion ; and whatever it does, the mind that is confused will only create more confusion, more problems and conflict. A mind that escapes from

the actual, from the facts of relationship, shall never find God, a mind that is agitated by belief shall not know truth. But the mind that understands its relationship with property, with people, with ideas, the mind which no longer struggles with the problems which relationship creates, and for which the solution is not withdrawal, but the understanding of love —such a mind alone can understand reality. Truth cannot be known by a mind that is confused in relationship, or that escapes from relationship into isolation, but by the mind that understands itself in action ; and only such a mind shall know the truth. A quiet mind, a silent mind,

cannot come into being through any form of compulsion, through any form of discipline, because the mind is quiet only when it understands its relationship to property, to people and to ideas, and, do what it will, the mind is not quiet when it is disturbed by the fact of its relationship to these. The mind that is made quiet without understanding its relationship, is a dead mind; but the mind that has no belief, that is quiet because it understands relationship, such a mind is silent, creative, and it shall know reality.

March 14, 1950

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS
1949-1950
(*Verbatim Report*)

SERIES II—CEYLON

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS

1949 - 1950

(*Verbatim Report*)

SERIES II -- CEYLON

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS
1949 - 1950

(*Verbatim Report*)

SERIES II—CEYLON

Copyright 1951 by Krishnamurti Writings Inc

Published by
KRISHNAMURTI WRITINGS INC
OJAI, CALIFORNIA
MADRAS, INDIA
LONDON, ENGLAND

Translation and all rights reserved
Printed in India at the G. S. Press, Madras

I

I think it is important to know how to listen. Most of us do not really listen at all; we are so accustomed to putting away the things we don't want to hear, that we have almost become deaf to the problems that concern us. It is important, is it not ?, how we listen to everything that is going on about us; how we listen, not only to the song of the birds, the sounds in nature, but to each other's voices—that is, how extensively we are aware of the problems of the day at different levels. Because, it is only in hearing rightly, and not as we want to hear, that we begin to understand the many problems, whether economic, social or religious. Life itself is a complex problem which cannot be solved at any one particular level. So we must be able to listen completely and fully, particularly to what is being said. This evening, at least, we might try to listen so that we understand each other as fully as we can. The difficulty is that most of us listen with prejudice to what is being said; we come to a conclusion about what is being said based on our own ideas, and our minds are already made up. We compare what is being said with the words of some other teacher, and naturally our reaction is conditioned and not a direct response to what is being said. So, if I may suggest it this evening, please listen fully without any prejudice, without any conclusion, without comparing; listen to find out what is actually being said. Because, the world is in a very terrible state; and whether you have riches, own several cars, a comfortable house, a good bank account, or have barely enough to live; whether you belong to a particular religious or political party, or to none, these problems have to be understood. I shall be dealing with these problems during the next five

weeks, not only here, but also at the discussions to be held on Tuesdays and Thursdays; and we must first learn the art of listening—which is quite a difficult task—so that we get the full significance of what is being said. You cannot get the full significance of what is being said if you listen through the screen of your own prejudice; and the art of listening consists in removing that prejudice, if only for the time being, and trying to understand the problem completely. Thus we shall be able to deal with the problems that arise every day in our lives.

Now, we all have problems, have we not ?, and we cannot shut our eyes to them or approach them with a pattern of action, either of the left or of the right, with a prejudice which we have formed out of our own knowledge or the knowledge of experts. Surely, the problem is always new; any problem is always new at any level; and if we approach the problem with a pattern of action, whether of the left, the right or the centre, then our response is obviously conditioned, which creates a barrier in understanding the problem itself. That is our difficulty. Life is a process of challenge and response—otherwise there is no life. Life is a response, a reaction to a demand, to a challenge, to a stimulus; and if our response is conditioned, obviously that creates conflict, which is a problem. Consciously or unconsciously, whether we are aware of it or not, most of us are in conflict, in turmoil; and to understand this inward confusion which has brought about confusion outwardly, whether political, religious or economic, we must know how to approach the problem, how to approach this enormous and increasing confusion and misery. There is no decrease, no lessening of sorrow, politically, religiously, socially, or in any other way. Whatever we do, whatever religious or political leaders we follow, creates further disas-

ter; and our problem is how to act so that that very action does not create a new problem, does not produce a further catastrophe; so that reformation does not need further reform. That is the situation each one of us has to face.

Surely, this increasing confusion arises because we approach the problem with a pattern of action, with an ideology, whether political or religious. Organized religion obviously prevents the understanding of the problem because the mind is conditioned by dogma and belief. Our difficulty is how to understand the problem directly, not through any particular religious or political conditioning; how to understand the problem so that the conflict may cease, not temporarily but completely, so that man can live fully, without the misery of tomorrow or the burden of yesterday. Surely, that is what we must find out: how to meet the problem anew; because, every problem, whether political, economic, religious, social, or personal, is ever new, and it cannot be met with the old. Perhaps this is putting it in a way different from that to which you are accustomed, but it is actually the issue. After all, life is a constantly changing environment. We would like to sit back and be comfortable, we would like to shelter ourselves in religion and belief, or in knowledge based on particular facts. We would like to be comfortable, we would like to be gratified, we would like not to be disturbed; but life, which is ever changing, ever new, is always disturbing to the old. So, our question is, how to meet the challenge afresh. We are the result of the past, our thought is the outcome of yesterday; and with yesterday we obviously cannot meet today, because today is new. When we approach the new with yesterday, we are continuing the conditioning of yesterday in understanding today. So our problem in approaching the new is how

to understand the old, and therefore be free of the old. The old cannot understand the new—you cannot put new wine in old bottles. So, it is important to understand the old, which is the past, which is the mind based on thinking. Thought, idea, is the outcome of the past; whether it is historical or scientific knowledge, or mere prejudice and superstition, idea is obviously the outcome of the past. We would not be able to think if we had no memory; memory is the residue of experience, memory is the response of thought. To understand the challenge, which is new, we have to understand the total process of the self which is the outcome of our past, the outcome of our conditioning, environmentally, socially, climatically, politically, economically—the whole structure of ourselves. Therefore, to understand the problem is to understand ourselves; the understanding of the world begins with the understanding of ourselves. The problem is not the world, but you in relationship with another, which creates a problem; and that problem extended becomes the world problem. So, to understand this enormous, complex machine, this conflict, pain, confusion, misery, we must begin with ourselves—but not individualistically, in opposition to the mass. There is no such thing as that abstraction called the mass; but when you and I do not understand ourselves, when we follow a leader and are hypnotized by words, then we become the mass and are exploited. So, the solution to the problem is not to be found in isolation, in withdrawal to a monastery, to a mountain or a cave, but in understanding the whole problem of ourselves in relationship. You cannot live in isolation; to be, is to be related. So, our problem is relationship, which causes conflict, which brings misery, constant trouble. As long as we do not understand that relationship, it will be a source of endless pain and

struggle. Understanding ourselves, which is self-knowledge, is the beginning of wisdom; and for self-knowledge you cannot go to a book —there is no book that can teach it to you. Know yourself; and once you understand yourself, you can deal with the problems that confront each one of us every day. Self-knowledge brings tranquillity to the mind, and then only can truth come into being. Truth cannot be sought after. Truth is the unknown, and that which you seek is already known. Truth comes into being unsought when the mind is without prejudice, when there is the understanding of the whole process of ourselves.

Several questions have been sent in, and I am going to answer some of them. It is very easy to ask questions. Anybody can ask a flippant or stupid question, but to ask the right question is much more difficult. Only in asking a right question is there a right answer, because only then is the problem of the questioner revealed.

Question : You say that you are not going to act as a guru to anyone. Cannot one who has understood the truth convey his understanding to another to help him also to understand ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Surely, whether a guru is necessary or not is not important: the problem is why we want a guru, why we seek a guru. That is the problem, isn't it? If we can understand that, then we will find out whether truth can be conveyed to another. Why do you need a guru, a teacher, a leader, a guide? Obviously you will say, "I need him because I am confused, I do not know what to do, and I am seeking truth." Let us not deceive ourselves about it. You don't know what truth is, therefore you go to a teacher, asking him to teach you what truth is. You want someone to help you, to guide

you out of your confusion; you are unhappy, and you want to be happy; you are dissatisfied, and you want to be satisfied. So, you choose your guru according to your satisfaction. (Laughter). May I suggest something? When you laugh at something serious, it indicates a very superficial state of mind. By laughing, you pass off the disturbing idea; so, if I may suggest, let us be a little more serious. Because, our problems are very serious, and we cannot approach them like flighty schoolboys—which is the way we are behaving, though we may have grey beards.

So, the question is, not whether a guru is necessary, but why do we want one? We want someone to give us a comforting hand—that is what we want. We don't want the truth, because the truth can be extraordinarily disturbing. We really don't want to understand what truth is, so we go to a guru to give us the satisfaction we want; and as we are confused, obviously we choose a guru or a leader who is also confused. When we choose a guru out of our confusion, that guru must also be confused, otherwise we wouldn't choose him. To understand yourself is essential, and a guru who is worthy of that name must obviously tell you that. But to most of us, this is a tiresome business; we want quick relief, a panacea, so we turn to a guru who will give us a satisfactory pill. We are searching not for truth but for comfort; and the man who gives us comfort, enslaves us.

Can truth be conveyed to another? I can give you a description of something which is over, which is past, and therefore not real; I can tell you about the past, and we can communicate with each other on the verbal level about what is known; but we cannot communicate with each other about something which we are not experiencing. Description is always of the past, not the present; therefore the present cannot be

described; and reality is only in the present. So, when you go to another to be told what truth is, he can only tell you of the experience which is over; and the experience which is over is not truth, it is merely knowledge. Knowledge is not wisdom; there can be description on the verbal level of knowledge and facts, but to describe something which is in constant movement is impossible. That which is described is not truth. Truth must be experienced from moment to moment; and if you meet today with the measure of yesterday, you will not understand truth.

So, a guru is not essential. On the contrary, a guru is an impediment. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. No guru can give you self-knowledge; and without self-knowledge, do what you will, act in any manner you like, follow any leader, any social or religious pattern—you are only creating further misery. But when through self-knowledge the mind is free of impediments and limitations, then truth comes into being.

Question: You are reported as having said that ideas are not going to bring people together. Please explain how, according to you, people can be brought together to create a better world.

KRISHNAMURTI: Let us find out what we mean by ideas; and as I have said, please listen, not with prejudice, not with a conclusion, but listen as you would to someone whom you really like. What do you mean by ideas, what do you mean by belief, what do you mean by ideology? Let us think this out, investigate together. Do ideas bring people together, or separate people? Idea is obviously the verbal version of thought. Thought is response to conditioning, is it not? You are Sinhalese, Buddhists, Christians, or what you will, and your thought is conditioned according to your back-

ground. Background is memory, obviously; memory responds to stimulus, to challenge, and the response of memory to challenge is called thinking. Surely, you think according to the pattern in which you have been brought up—as Buddhists, as Christians, according to the left or the right, or God knows what. You are conditioned to believe certain things, and not to believe other things. That conditioning is memory, and the response of memory is thought. Thought examines ideas, and being conditioned, responds according to that conditioning, going either to the left or to the right. So, ideas gather people according to the particular pattern in which they have been brought up; and obviously ideas can oppose ideas.

As it is perhaps a little too abstract, let us put it differently. Suppose you are a real Buddhist, not a verbal Buddhist, but an active one—what does it mean? You believe in certain things and act according to that belief; and a Christian or a Communist will act according to a different ideology. How can these two ideas ever meet? Each idea, each thought, is the result of its own conditioning; and how can one idea meet another? All one idea can do is to expand and gather people around itself, as also does any other idea. So, ideas can never bring about unity. On the contrary, they divide people. You are a Christian, I am a Buddhist, another is a Hindu or a Mussulman; I believe, you don't believe; so we are at loggerheads. Why? Why are we so divided by ideas? Because that is the only thing we have—the word is the only thing we have; therefore ideas have become extraordinarily important, and we gather around ideas to act: the Christian in opposition to the Communist, Labour in opposition to Capitalism, Capitalism in opposition to Socialism. Idea is not action, idea prevents action. We will have to think it out, we will go into it at

another discussion. Action based upon idea divides people. That is why there is starvation in the world, there is hunger, there is misery, there is war. We have ideas about it; but idea prevents our understanding of the problem, because the problem is not an idea. The problem is pain and conflict. It is very comforting to have an idea about pain, suffering, trouble, exploitation; then you can talk about it and not act. Think it out and you will see, if you are really going into the problem and not merely reacting according to a certain pattern, that ideas are dividing people. Have you not noticed? You Sinhalese are fighting for nationalism, which is just an idea; Hindus are against Europeans, Germans and Americans against Russians. All over the world nationalism, which is an idea, prevents people from coming together; and because nationalism is elementarily gratifying and stupid, you are satisfied with it. Everywhere the word 'nationalism' arises like a wall and keeps people apart. So, throughout the world, ideas are separating people, setting man against man. The ideas which we worship are the very denial of love; they have no significance, they cannot bring about a radical transformation. To bring about this fundamental revolution, you must begin to understand yourself; it is only then that you can bring about unity and not through ideas.

Question: I feel uncertain about everything and consequently find it difficult to act well, as I fear that my action will only lead to further confusion. Is there a way I can act in the matter to avoid confusion.

KRISHNAMURTI: Obviously, without knowing yourself, whatever you do is bound to increase confusion; if you don't know the whole structure of your being, your action will inevitably create mischief, though

you may have a perfect pattern of conduct. That is why reformation, revolution according to a pattern, is a disintegrating factor in society: it merely carries on the past in a modified way. Self-knowledge, which you cannot buy in a book or get from any teacher, is to be discovered in relationship with people, with ideas. Relationship is a mirror in which you see yourself as you are. Nothing can live in isolation. One must understand relationship and not merely condemn it, justify it or identify oneself with it. We condemn because that is the easiest way to get rid of something, like putting a child in the corner. If I want to understand my child, my neighbour, my wife, I must study that person, I must be aware in my relationship with that person, mustn't I? So, to act without increasing confusion is possible only through self-knowledge.

Question: You are reported as having said that religion cannot provide a solution to the problems of humanity. Is that correct?

KRISHNAMURTI: Now, what do we mean by religion? As we know it, it is organized belief, dogma, action according to a particular pattern, is it not? Organized belief is the experience of someone else arranged according to a pattern of yesterday; and you are conditioned by that belief. Is that religion? The pattern may be of the left, of the right, or of the centre; or it may be a so-called divine plan--there is not much difference between them; all have their ideals, all have their Utopia or heaven, so all may be called religion, each perpetuating exploitation. Now, is that religion? Obviously, belief, with its authority and dogmas, with its pageantry and sensation, is not religion. So, what is religion? That is our question. It is simply a word. The word 'door' is not a door, but only the symbol of something else. Similarly, religion is something be-

hind the conditioned response evoked by that word, which means that we have to discover the thing behind the word. That thing is the unknown, isn't it? What you know has already receded into the past. There must be direct experiencing of what is; and for this the first requirement is freedom, which means you must be free of the false, which is belief, not at the end but at the beginning. You must have the freedom to discover what is false—surely that is religion. The whole process of yourself must be understood; for without understanding yourself, there is no wisdom. The beginning of wisdom is the understanding of yourself, and that is meditation.

December 25, 1950

II

We were saying how important it is, before we ask what to do or how to act, to discover what is right thinking; because, without right thinking, obviously there cannot be right action. Action according to a pattern, according to a belief, has set man against man, as we discussed last Sunday. There can be no right thinking as long as there is no self-knowledge; because, without self-knowledge, how can one know what one is actually thinking? We do a great deal of thinking, and there is a great deal of activity; but such thought and action produce conflict and antagonism, which we see, not only in ourselves, but also about us in the world. So, our problem is, is it not?, how to think rightly, which will produce right action, thereby eliminating the conflict and confusion which we find not only in ourselves, but in the world about us.

Now, to find out what is right thinking, we must enquire into what is self-knowledge; because, if we don't know what we think, or if our thought is based on the background

which is our conditioning, whatever we think is obviously merely a reaction and therefore leads to further conflict. So, before we can find out what is right thinking, we have to know what is self-knowledge. Self-knowledge, surely, is not mere learning a particular kind of thinking. Self-knowledge is not based on ideas, belief, or conclusion. It must be a living thing, otherwise it ceases to be self-knowledge and becomes mere information. There is a difference between information which is knowledge, and wisdom which is knowing the processes of our thoughts and feelings. But most of us are caught up in information, superficial knowledge, and so we are incapable of going much deeper into the problem. To discover the whole process of self-knowledge, we have to be aware in relationship. Relationship is the only mirror we have, a mirror that will not distort, a mirror in which we can exactly and precisely see our thought unfolding itself. Isolation, which many people seek, is the surreptitious building up of resistance against relationship. Isolation obviously prevents the understanding of relationship—relationship with people, with ideas, with things. As long as we don't know our relationship, actually what is, between ourselves and our property, ourselves and people, ourselves and ideas, obviously there must be confusion and conflict.

So, we can find out what is right thinking only in relationship. That is, we can discover in relationship how we think from moment to moment, what are our reactions, and thereby proceed step by step to the unfoldment of right thinking. This is not an abstract or difficult thing to do: to watch exactly what is taking place in our relationship, what are our reactions, and thus discover the truth of each thought, each feeling. But if we bring to it an idea or a preconception of what relationship should be, then obviously that pre-

vents the uncovering, the unfoldment of what is. That is our difficulty: we have already made up our minds as to what relationship should be. To most of us, relationship is a term for comfort, for gratification, for security; and in that relationship we use property, ideas and persons for our gratification. We use belief as a means of security. Relationship is not merely a mechanical adjustment. When we use people, it necessitates possession, physical or psychological; and in possessing someone we create all the problems of jealousy, envy, loneliness and conflict. Because, if we examine it a little more closely and deeply, we will see that using a person or property for gratification is a process of isolation. This process of isolation is not actual relationship at all. So our difficulty and our mounting problem comes with the lack of understanding of relationship, which is essentially self-knowledge. If we do not know how we are related to people, to property, to ideas, then our relationship will inevitably bring about conflict. That is our whole problem at the present time, is it not?—relationship not only between people, but between groups of people, between nations, between ideologies, either of the left or of the right, religious or secular. Therefore, it is important to understand fundamentally your relationship with your wife, with your husband, with your neighbour; for relationship is a door through which we can discover ourselves, and through that discovery we understand what is right thinking.

Right thinking, surely, is entirely different from right thought. Right thought is static. You can learn about right thought, but you cannot learn about right thinking; because right thinking is movement, it is not static. Right thought you can learn from a book, from a teacher, or gather information about; but you cannot have right thinking by following a pattern or a mould. Right thinking

is the understanding of relationship from moment to moment, which uncovers the whole process of the self.

At whatever level you live, there is conflict, not only individual conflict, but also world conflict. The world is you, it is not separate from you. What you are, the world is. There must be a fundamental revolution in your relationship with people, with ideas; there must be a fundamental change, and that change must begin, not outside you, but in your relationships. Therefore, it is essential for a man of peace, for a man of thought, to understand himself; for without self-knowledge his efforts only create further confusion and further misery. Be aware of the total process of yourself. You need no guru, no book, to understand from moment to moment your relationship with all things.

Question : Why do you waste your time preaching instead of helping the world in a practical way?

KRISHNAMURTI : Now, what do you mean by 'practical'? You mean bringing about a change in the world, a better economic adjustment, a better distribution of wealth, a better relationship—or, to put it more brutally, helping you to find a better job. You want to see a change in the world, every intelligent man does; and you want a method to bring about that change, and therefore you ask me why I waste my time preaching instead of doing something about it. Now, is what I am actually doing a waste of time? It would be a waste of time, would it not?, if I introduced a new set of ideas to replace the old ideology, the old pattern. Perhaps that is what you want me to do. But instead of pointing out a so-called practical way to act, to live, to get a better job, to create a better world, is it not important to find out what are the impediments which actually prevent a real revolution—not a

revolution of the left or the right, but a fundamental, radical revolution, not based on ideas? Because, as we have discussed it, ideals, beliefs, ideologies, dogmas, prevent action. There cannot be a world transformation, a revolution, as long as action is based on ideas; because action then is merely reaction; therefore ideas become much more important than action, and that is precisely what is taking place in the world, isn't it? To act, we must discover the impediments that prevent action. But most of us don't want to act—that is our difficulty. We prefer to discuss, we prefer to substitute one ideology for another, and so we escape from action through ideology. Surely, that is very simple, is it not? The world at the present time is facing many problems: over-population, starvation, division of people into nationalities and classes, and so on. Why isn't there a group of people sitting together trying to solve the problems of nationalism? But if we try to become international while clinging to our nationality, we create another problem; and that is what most of us do. So, you see that ideals are really preventing action. A statesman, an eminent authority, has said the world can be organized and all the people fed. Then why is it not done? Because of conflicting ideas, beliefs, and nationalisms. Therefore, ideas are actually preventing the feeding of people; and most of us play with ideas and think we are tremendous revolutionaries, hypnotizing ourselves with such words as 'practical'. What is important is to free ourselves from ideas, from nationalisms, from all religious beliefs and dogmas, so that we can act, not according to a pattern or an ideology, but as needs demand; and, surely, to point out the hindrances and impediments that prevent such action is not a waste of time, is not a lot of hot air. What you are doing is obviously nonsense. Your ideas and beliefs,

your political, economic and religious panaceas, are actually dividing people and leading to war. It is only when the mind is free of idea and belief that it can act rightly. A man who is patriotic, nationalistic, can never know what it is to be brotherly, though he may talk about it; on the contrary, his actions, economically and in every direction, are conducive to war. So, there can be right action and therefore radical, lasting transformation, only when the mind is free of ideas, not superficially, but fundamentally; and freedom from ideas can take place only through self-awareness and self-knowledge.

Question: I am a teacher, and after studying what you say, I see that most of the present education is harmful or futile. What can I do about it?

KRISHNAMURTI: Surely, the question is what we mean by education, and why we are educating people. We see throughout the world that education has failed, because it is producing more and more destruction and war. Education so far has furthered industrialism and war; that has been the process for the last century or so. What is actually taking place is war, conflict, unceasing waste of one's own effort, everything leading to more conflict, greater confusion and antagonism—and is that the end of education? So, to find out how to educate, not only must the educator be educated, but there must be an understanding of what it is all about and what we are living for, the end and purpose of life. When we seek the purpose of life, we can find it only as a self-projection. The end and purpose of life, obviously, is living. But living is not a goal, happiness is not a goal. It is only when we are unhappy that we seek the goal of happiness. Similarly, when life is confused, then we want a purpose,

an end. So, we have to find out what living means. Is it merely a technique, a capacity to earn money mechanically, or is it a process of understanding the total way of our whole existence? What is happiness? Is it to be educated, to pass the B. A. or M. A., or God knows what? Apart from profession, what are you actually? What is your state of being apart from your social status, so many rupees earned from such and such a job—strip yourselves of these, and what are you? Hardly anything; nothing very great, but something shallow and empty.

Knowledge is what we call education. You can get information from any book as long as you can read; so education so far has actually been an escape from ourselves; and, as with all escapes, it must inevitably create further confusion and further misery. Without understanding the total process of yourself, which is understanding relationship, mere gathering of information and mere memorizing of books in order to pass examinations is utterly futile. Surely I am not exaggerating. Education is understanding, and helping others to understand, the total process of our existence. The teacher must understand the whole significance of his action in relationship with society, with the world; so it is essential that the educator be educated. To bring about revolution in the world, transformation must take place in you; but we avoid radical revolution in ourselves, and try to bring about revolution in the State, in the economic world. Therefore education must begin with you, with the guru. When you give your background to the child, the mind of the child responds to that conditioning; and it is only through freedom from conditioning that there can be the true salvation of the world.

Question: I am a smoker, and I am trying to break myself of the

habit of smoking. Can you help me? (Laughter).

KRISHNAMURTI: I do not know why you are laughing. The questioner wants to know how to stop smoking. It is a problem to him, and by merely laughing it away you have not solved it. Perhaps you also smoke, or have some other habit. Let us find out how to understand this whole process of habit-forming and habit-breaking. We can take the example of smoking, and you can substitute your own habit, your own particular problem, and experiment with your own problem directly as I am experimenting with the problem of smoking. It is a problem, it becomes a problem, when I want to give it up; as long as I am satisfied with it, it is not a problem. The problem arises when I have to do something about a particular habit, when the habit becomes a disturbance. Smoking has created a disturbance, so I want to be free of it. I want to stop smoking, I want to be rid of it, to put it aside; so my approach to smoking is one of resistance or condemnation. That is, I don't want to smoke; so my approach is either to suppress it, condemn it, or to find a substitute for it: instead of smoking, to chew. Now, can I look at the problem free of condemnation, justification, or suppression? Can I look at my smoking without any sense of rejection? Try to experiment with it now, as I am talking, and you will see how extraordinarily difficult it is not to reject or accept. Because, our whole tradition, our whole background, is urging us to reject or to justify, rather than to be curious about it. Instead of being passively watchful, the mind always operates on the problem. So, the problem is not smoking, but our approach to smoking which creates the problem. Because, if you find smoking rather stupid, a waste of money, and so on—if you really see that, you will drop it, there will be no problem. Smoking, drinking, or any other habit, is

an escape from something else; it makes you feel socially at ease. It is an escape from your own nervousness, or from a disturbed state; and the habit becomes a means of your conditioning. So, smoking is not the problem. When you approach smoking with your memory, your recollection of previous trials and failures, you approach it with a conclusion already made. Therefore, the problem is not in the fact, but in your approach to the fact. You have tried by discipline, control, denial, and you have not succeeded. So you say, "I shall go on smoking, I cannot stop"—which is after all an attempt to justify yourself; which means your approach is not very intelligent. So, smoking or any other habit is not a problem. The problem is thought, which is your approach to the fact. You are the problem, not the habit which you have created; and thus you will see, if you really try, how difficult it is for the mind to be free from the sense of condemnation and justification. When your mind is free, the problem of smoking or any other problem is non-existent.

Question : Is continence or chastity necessary for the attainment of liberation ?

KRISHNAMURTI : The question is wrongly put. For the attainment of liberation, nothing is necessary. You cannot attain it through bargaining, through sacrifice, through elimination; it is not a thing that you can buy. If you do these things you will get a thing of the marketplace, therefore not real. Truth cannot be bought, there is no means to truth; if there is a means, the end is not truth, because means and end are one, they are not separate. Chastity as a means to liberation, to truth, is a denial of truth. Chastity is not a coin with which you buy it. You cannot buy truth with any coin, and you cannot buy chastity with

any coin. You can buy only those things which you know, but you cannot buy truth because you don't know it. Truth comes into being only when the mind is quiet, still; so the problem is entirely different, is it not?

Why do we think chastity is essential? Why has sex become a problem? That is really the question, isn't it? We shall understand what it is to be chaste when we understand this corroding problem of sex. Let us find out why sex has become such an extremely important factor in our life, more of a problem than property, money, and so on. What do we mean by sex? Not merely the act, but thinking about it, feeling about it, anticipating it, escaping from it—that is our problem. Our problem is sensation, wanting more and more. Watch yourself, don't watch your neighbour. Why are your thoughts so occupied with sex. Chastity can exist only when there is love, and without love there is no chastity. Without love, chastity is merely lust in a different form. To become chaste is to become something else; it is like a man becoming powerful, succeeding as a prominent lawyer, politician, or whatever else—the change is on the same level. That is not chastity, but merely the end-result of a dream, the outcome of the continual resistance to a particular desire. So, our problem is not how to become chaste, or to find out what are the things necessary for liberation, but to understand this problem which we call sex. Because, it is an enormous problem, and you cannot approach it with condemnation or justification. Of course, you can easily isolate yourself from it—but then you will be creating another problem. This all-important, engrossing and destructive problem of sex can be understood only when the mind liberates itself from its own anchorage. Please think it out, don't brush it aside. As long as you are bound through fear, through tradition, to any particular job, activity,

belief, idea, as long as you are conditioned by and attached to all that, you will have this problem of sex. Only when the mind is free of fear is there the fathomless, the inexhaustible; and only then does this problem take its ordinary place. Then you can deal with it simply and effectively; then it is not a problem. So, chastity ceases to be a problem where there is love. Then life is not a problem, life is to be lived completely in the fullness of love; and that revolution will bring about a new world.

Question : The idea of death terrifies me. Can you help me to overcome the dread of my own death and that of my loved ones?

KRISHNAMURTI: Let us think this problem out together and go to the end of it; because we must find the truth of it, and not merely an opinion. Opinions are not truth. Death is a fact. You may like to dodge it, to escape from it through belief in re-incarnation, continuity, growth; but it is a fact. Why are we terrified of it? What do we mean by death? Surely, we mean the end of something—of the body, and of our experiences which we have gathered throughout life: the psychological ending of accumulated experiences. Innumerable books are written about death, about the hereafter. But we are afraid of death. So, we try to find immortality, continuity, through property, through title, through name, through achievement, so that desire, memory, can be immortalized. Why do you want to continue? What is there to continue? Your memories? Memories are but accumulated experiences. Only in ending is there creation, not in continuity; therefore there must be death. In death only is there renewal, not in continuing. Incompleteness of action in the present creates fear of death; and as long as there is the desire for continuity,

there must be fear. That which continues must decay, it cannot be renewed; but in dying there is creation of the new.

January 1, 1950.

III

One of our major problems is this question of creative living. Obviously, most of us have dull lives, we have only a very superficial reaction. After all, most of our responses are superficial and thereby create innumerable problems. Creative living does not necessarily mean becoming a big architect or a great writer. This is merely capacity, and capacity is entirely different from creative living. No one need know that you are creative, but you yourself can know that state of extraordinary happiness, a quality of indestructibility; but that is not easily realized, because most of us have innumerable problems—political, social, economic, religious, family—which we try to solve according to certain explanations, certain rules, traditions, any sociological or religious pattern with which we are familiar. But our solution of one problem seems inevitably to create other problems, and we set up a net of problems ever multiplying and increasing in their destructiveness. When we try to find the answer, a way out of this mess, this confusion, we seek the answer at one particular level. One must have the capacity to go beyond all levels, because the creative way of living cannot be found at any particular level. That creative action comes into being only in understanding relationship, and relationship is communion with another. So, it is not really a selfish outlook to be concerned with individual action. We seem to think that we can do very little in this world. that only the big political famous writers, the great .

leaders, are capable of extraordinary action. Actually, you and I are infinitely more capable of bringing about a radical transformation than the professional politicians and economists. If we are concerned with our own lives, if we understand our relationship with others, we will have created a new society; otherwise, we will but perpetuate the present chaotic mess and confusion.

So, it is not out of selfishness, not because of a desire for power, that one is concerned with individual action; and if we can find a way of living which is creative, not merely conforming to religious, social, political or economic standards as we are doing at the present time, then I think we will be able to solve our many problems. At present we are merely repetitive gramophones, perhaps changing records occasionally under pressure; but most of us always play the same tunes for every occasion. It is this constant repetition, this perpetuation of tradition, that is the source of the problem with all its complexities. We seem to be incapable of breaking away from conformity, though we may substitute a new conformity for the present one, or try to modify the present pattern. It is a constant process of repetition, imitation. We are Buddhists, Christians or Hindus, we belong to the left or to the right. By quoting from the various sacred books, by mere repetition, we think we shall solve our innumerable problems. Surely, repetition is not going to solve human problems. What has the 'revolutionary' done for the so-called masses? Actually, the problems are still there. What happens is that this constant repetition of an idea prevents the understanding of the problem itself. Through self-knowledge one has the capacity to free oneself from this repetition. Then it is possible to be in that creative state which is always new, and therefore one is always ready to meet each problem afresh.

After all, our difficulty is that, having these immense problems, we meet them with previous conclusions, with the record of experience, either our own or acquired through others; and so we meet the new with the old, which creates a further problem. Creative living is being without that background; the new is met as the new, therefore it does not create further problems. Therefore it is necessary to meet the new with the new until we can understand the total process, the whole problem of mounting disaster, misery, starvation, war, unemployment, inequality, the battle between conflicting ideologies. That struggle and confusion is not to be solved by repetition of old ways. If you will really look a little more closely without prejudice, without religious bias, you will see much bigger problems; and being free from conformity, from belief, you will be able to meet the new. This capacity to meet the new with the new is called the creative state, and that surely is the highest form of religion. Religion is not merely belief, it is not the following of certain rituals, dogmas, the calling yourself this or that. Religion is really experiencing a state in which there is creation. This is not an idea, a process. It can be realized when there is freedom from self. There can be freedom from self only through understanding the self in relationship—but there can be no understanding in isolation.

As I suggested in answering the questions last Sunday, it is important that we experience each question as it arises, and not merely listen to my answers; that we discover together the truth of the matter, which is much more difficult. Most of us would like to be apart from the problem, watching others; but if we can discover together, take the journey together, so that it is your experience and not mine, though you are listening to my words—if we can go together; then it will be of lasting value and importance.

Question : Do you advocate vegetarianism ? Would you object to the inclusion of an egg in your diet ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Is that really a very great problem, whether we should have an egg or not ? Perhaps most of you are concerned with non-killing. That is really the crux of the matter, is it not ? Perhaps most of you eat meat or fish. You avoid killing by going to a butcher, or you put the blame on the killer, the butcher—that is only dodging the problem. If you like to eat eggs, you may get infertile eggs to avoid killing. But this is a very superficial question—the problem is much deeper. You don't want to kill animals for your stomach, but you do not mind supporting governments that are organized to kill. All sovereign governments are based on violence, they must have armies, navies, and air forces. You don't mind supporting them, but you object to the terrible calamity of eating an egg ! (Laughter). See how ridiculous the whole thing is ; investigate the mentality of the gentleman who is nationalistic, who does not mind the exploitation and the ruthless destruction of people, to whom wholesale massacre is nothing—but who has scruples as to what goes into his mouth. (Laughter). So, there is much more involved in this problem—not only the whole question of killing, but the right-employment of the mind. The mind may be used narrowly, or it is capable of extraordinary activity; and most of us are satisfied with superficial activity, with security, sexual satisfaction, amusement, religious belief—with that, we are satisfied and discard entirely the deeper response and wider significance of life. Even the religious leaders have become petty in their response to life. After all, the problem is not only killing animals but human beings, which is more important. You may refrain from using animals and de-

grading them, you may be compassionate about killing them, but what is important in this question is the whole problem of exploitation and killing—not only the slaughter of human beings in war time, but the way you exploit people, the way you treat your servants, and look down on them as inferiors. Probably you are not paying attention to this, because it is near home. You would rather discuss God, reincarnation—but nothing requiring immediate action and responsibility.

So, if you are really concerned with not killing, you should not be a nationalist, you should not call yourself Sinhalese, German or Russian. Also you must have right employment, make right use of machinery. It is very important in modern society to have right employment, because today every action leads to war, the whole thing is geared for war ; but at least we can find out the wrong professions ; and avoid them intelligently. Obviously, the army, the navy, are wrong professions ; so is the profession of law which encourages litigation, and the police, especially the secret police. So, right employment must be found and exercised by each one, and only then can there be the cessation of killing which will bring about peace among men. But the economic pressure is so great in the modern world that very few can withstand it. Almost no one is concerned with seeking right profession ; and if you are concerned not to kill, then you have to do far more than merely avoid the killing of animals, which means you have to go into this whole problem of right employment. Though the question may appear very petty, if you go into it a little more carefully you will see that it is a very great question ; because, what you are, you make the world to be. If you are greedy, angry, dominating, possessive, you will inevitably create a social structure that will bring about further conflict, misery, further destruction. But unfortunately, most

of us are not concerned with any of these things. Most of us are concerned with immediate pleasures, with every-day living; and if we can get them, we are satisfied. We do not want to look into the deeper and wider problems; though we know they exist, we want to avoid them. By avoiding these problems, they are increased, you have not solved them. To solve them, they cannot be approached through any particular ideology, either of the left or of the right. Look at these problems more closely and effectively and you will begin to understand the total process of yourself in relation to others, which is society.

But you will tell me that I have not answered the question about the egg, whether to eat an egg or not. Surely, intelligence is the important thing—not what goes into your mouth, but what comes out of it; and most of us have filled our hearts with the things of the mind, and our minds are very small, shallow. Our problem is to find out how to bring about a transformation in that which is shallow and small; and this transformation can come about only through understanding the shallow. Those of you who want to go into the question more deeply will have to find out whether you are contributing to war and how to avoid it, whether indirectly you are the cause of destruction. If you can really solve that question, then you can easily settle the superficial matter of whether you should be a vegetarian or not. Tackle the problem at a much deeper level and you will find the answer.

Question : You say that reality or understanding exists in the interval between two thoughts. Will you please explain.

KRISHNAMURTI : This is really a different way of asking the question, "What is meditation?" As I answer this question, please experiment

with it, discover how your own mind works, which is after all a process of meditation. I am thinking aloud with you, not superficially—I have not studied. I am just thinking aloud with you about the question, so that we can all journey together and find the truth of this question.

The questioner asks about the interval between two thoughts in which there can be understanding. Before we can enquire into that, we must find out what we mean by thought. What do you mean by thinking? Is this getting a little too serious? You must have patience to listen to it. When you think something—thought being an idea—, what do you mean by that? Is not thought a response to influence, the outcome of social, environmental influence? Is not thought the summation of all experience reacting? Say, for example, you have a problem, and you are trying to think about it, to analyze it, to study it. How do you do that? Are you not looking at the present problem with the experience of yesterday—yesterday being the past—with past knowledge, past history, past experience? So, that is the past, which is memory, responding to the present; and this response of memory to the present you call thinking. Thought is merely the response of the past in conjunction with the present, is it not?, and for most of us thought is a continuous process. Even when we are asleep there is constant activity in the form of dreams; there is never a moment when the mind is really still. We project a picture and live either in the past or the future, like many old and some young people do, or like the political leaders who are always promising a marvellous Utopia. (Laughter). And we accept it because we all want the future, so we sacrifice the present for the future; but we cannot know what is going to happen tomorrow or in fifty years' time.

So, thought is the response of the past in conjunction with the present; that is, thought is experience responding to challenge, which is reaction. There is no thought if there is no reaction. Response is the past background—you respond as a Buddhist, a Christian, according to the left or to the right. That is the background, and that is the constant response to challenge—and that response of the past to the present is called thinking. There is never a moment when thought is not. Have you not noticed that your mind is incessantly occupied with something or other—personal, religious, or political worries? It is constantly occupied; and what happens to your mind, what happens to any machinery, that is in constant use? It wears away. The very nature of the mind is to be occupied with something, to be in constant agitation, and we try to control it, to dominate it, to suppress it; and if we can succeed, we think we have become great saints and religious people, and then we stop thinking.

Now, you will see that in the process of thinking there is always an interval, a gap between two thoughts. As you are listening to me, what exactly is happening in your mind? You are listening, perhaps experiencing what we are talking about, waiting for information, the experience of the next moment. You are watchful; so there is passive watching, alert awareness. There is no response; there is a state of passiveness in which the mind is strongly aware, yet there is no thought—that is, you are really experiencing what I am talking about. Such passive watchfulness is the interval between two thoughts.

Suppose you have a new problem—and problems are always new—, how do you approach it? It is a new problem, not an old one. You may recognize it as old, but as long as it is a problem it is always new. It is like one of those modern pictures to

which you are entirely unaccustomed. What happens if you want to understand it? If you approach it with your classical training, your response to that challenge, which is that picture, is rejection; so if you want to understand the picture, your classical training will have to be put aside—just as, if you want to understand what I am talking about, you have to forget you are a Buddhist, a Christian, or what not. You must look at the picture free of your classical training, with passive awareness and watchfulness of mind, and then the picture begins to unfold itself and tell its story. That is possible only when the mind is in a state of watchfulness, without trying to condemn or justify the picture; it comes only when thought is not, when the mind is still. You can experiment with that and see how extraordinarily true is a still mind. Only then is it possible to understand. But the constant activity of the mind prevents the understanding of the problem.

To put it around the other way, what do you do when you have a problem, an acute problem? You think about it, don't you? What do you mean by 'think about it'? You mean working for an answer, searching for an answer, according to your previous conclusions. That is, you try to shape the problem to fit certain conclusions which you have, and if you can make it fit, you think you have solved it. But problems are not solved by being put into the pigeonholes of the mind. You think about the problem with the memory of past conclusions and try to find out what Christ, Buddha, X, Y or Z has said, and then apply those conclusions to the problem. Thereby you do not solve the problem, but cover it up with the residue of previous problems. When you have a really big and difficult problem, that process will not work. You say you have tried everything and you cannot solve it. That means you are not waiting for the problem to tell its

story. But when the mind is relaxed, no longer making an effort, when it is quiet for just a few seconds, then the problem reveals itself and it is solved. That happens when the mind is still, in the interval between two thoughts, between two responses. In that state of mind understanding comes; but it requires extraordinary watchfulness of every movement of thought. When the mind is aware of its own activity, its own process, then there is quietness. After all, self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation, and if you do not know the whole, total process of yourself, you cannot know the importance of meditation. Merely sitting in front of a picture or repeating phrases is not meditation. Meditation is a part of relationship; it is seeing the process of thought in the mirror of relationship. Meditation is not subjugation, but understanding the whole process of thinking. Then thought comes to an end, and only in that ending is there the beginning of understanding.

Question : What happens to an individual at death? Does he continue, or does he go to annihilation?

KRISHNAMURTI : Now, it is very interesting to find out from what point of view we are approaching this question. Please put this question to yourself and find out how you as an individual approach it. Why do you put this question? What is the motive that makes you ask about total annihilation? Either you are approaching the question because you want to know the truth of it and are therefore not seeking self-gratification; or you want a solution because you are afraid. If you approach it with the idea that you are afraid of death and want to continue, then your question will have a gratifying answer, because you are merely seeking consolation. Then you may just as well adopt a new belief that will satisfy you or take a drug that

will make you dull. When you suffer you want to be made dull. Suffering is the response of sensitiveness; that is, sensitiveness makes for pain, and when there is pain you want a drug. So, either you want to find the truth of this question, or you are merely seeking a means to lull yourself to sleep—only you don't put it so crudely. You want to be comforted, you ask because you are afraid of death and you want to be sure of continuity. According to your approach you will find the answer, obviously. If you are seeking consolation, then you are not seeking truth; if you are afraid, then you are not trying to find out what is real. So, first you have to be very earnest in your thinking. Most of us are afraid of seeking the truth. Most of us are scared of there being no continuity, and we want to be assured that we will continue. Let us find out whether there is continuity—you may want it, but it may not be there.

What do you mean by continuity and coming to an end? What is it that continues? We are trying to find the truth of continuity and the truth of non-continuity, so we have to examine what it is that continues in your daily life. Have you noticed yourself in continuation—in relation to your property, your family, your ideas? You say a hundred times, 'This is my property, my reputation', and it becomes continuity. You say, 'This is my name, my wife, my work, my job, these are my ambitions, my characteristics or tendencies; I am a big entity, or a little entity trying to become a big entity'—and that is what you are in daily life, not spiritually but actually. Obviously, those are all memories, and you want to know if that bundle of memories, identified as yourself, will continue. 'You' are not separate from the bundle. There is no 'you' as an entity different from memory. The 'you' may be placed at a higher level, but even at that level it is

within the whole field of memory, of thought; and you want to know whether it will continue. Memory is word, symbol, picture, image; without the word there is no memory. The symbol, the image, the past picture, the memory of certain relationships—all that is 'you', which is the word. You want to know whether that word, which is identified with memory, will continue. In other words, you are seeking immortality through memory identified as 'you'. You are not different from the various qualities which go toward making the 'you'. So, you are the house, the memory, the experience, the family; you are not separate from the idea. And you want to know whether that 'you' continues.

Now, why do you want to know? What is the motive, what is the urge? You say, 'I am finished, I must have space in which to grow, to become; life is too short, I must have another chance'. Now, have you noticed that idea, thought, can continue? You can experience it for yourself—it is very simple. Thought as memory, as idea, continues. So you have the question answered. The 'you' that continues is merely a bundle of memories; that is, when there is identification of thought as 'I am', this superficial thing in some form or other continues, as thought did before. The 'you' as an idea, as thought, continues; but that is not very satisfactory, because you have an idea that you are something more than thought, and you want to know if that something more continues. There is nothing more—'you' are merely the result of social, environmental influences; that is, 'you' are the result of conditioning. You may say, 'What nonsense it is to talk of a future life—it is superstitious rot'; others, who are differently conditioned, believe there is something more. Surely, there is not much difference between the two. Both are conditioned, one to believe and the other not to believe. Belief in

any form is detrimental to the discovery of truth. Belief in continuity and belief in non-continuity are both detrimental to the discovery of truth. To find out what truth is, there can be no fear and no belief—which fetters the mind. Only when continuity ends can you know the truth of what is beyond continuity.

To put it differently, death is the unknown, it is ever new, and to understand it you must go to it with a fresh mind, a mind that is new, not merely a continuation of the past. In that state you are capable of knowing the significance of death. At present we know neither life nor death, and we are anxious to know what death is. Thought must end for life to be. There must be death in order for life to flourish. When life is only the continuation of thought, such continuity can never know reality. If you are seeking continuity, you have it in your house, in your work, in your children, in your name, in your property, in certain qualities—all that is 'you', it is thought continued. Immortality can be known only when thinking ceases, when through understanding, the process of thought comes to an end. You can only think about something that you know. So when you think of yourself as a spiritual entity, it is your own projection, something born out of the past; therefore it is not spiritual. It is only when you understand continuity that thought comes to an end—which is an extraordinary process requiring a great deal of alertness, not discipline, vows, dogmas, creeds, beliefs, and all the rest of it. There is immortality only when the mind is completely still, and that stillness comes when thought is wholly understood.

Question: I pray to God, and my prayers are answered. Is this not proof of the existence of God?

KRISHNAMURTI: If you have proof of the existence of God, then it is

not God; (laughter) because proof is of the mind. How can the mind prove or disprove God? Therefore your god is a projection of the mind according to your satisfaction, appetite, happiness, pleasure or fear. Such a thing is not God, but merely a creation of thought, a projection of the known which is past. What is known is not God, though the mind may look for it, may be active in the search for God.

The questioner says that his prayers are answered, and asks if this is not proof of the existence of God. Do you want proof of love? When you love somebody, do you seek proof? If you demand proof of love, is that love? If you love your wife, your child, and you want proof, then love is surely a bargain. So your prayer to God is merely bargaining. (Laughter). Don't laugh it off, look at it seriously, as a fact. The questioner approaches what he calls God through supplication and petition. You cannot find reality through sacrifice, through duty, through responsibility, because these are means to an end, and the end is not different from the means. The means are the end.

The other part of the question is, "I pray to God, and my prayers are answered." Let us examine that. What do you mean by prayer? Do you pray when you are joyous, when you are happy, when there is no confusion, no misery?— You pray when there is misery, when there is disturbance, fear, turmoil, and your prayer is supplication, petition. When you are in misery, you want somebody to help you out, a higher entity to give you a helping hand; and that process of supplication in different forms is called prayer. So, what happens? You put out your begging bowl to someone, it does not matter who it is—an angel, or your own projection whom you call God. The moment you beg, you have something—but whether that something is real or not, is a different question. You

want your confusion, your miseries solved; so you get out your traditional phrases, you turn on your devotion, and the constant repetition obviously makes the mind quiet. But that is not quietness—the mind is merely dulled and put to sleep. In that induced quiet, when there is supplication there is an answer. But it is not at all an answer from God—it is from your own ornamental projection. Here is the answer to the question. But you do not want to enquire into all this, that is why the question is put. Your prayer is supplication—you are only concerned to get a response to your prayer because you want to be free from trouble. Something is gnawing at your heart, and by praying you make yourself dull and quiet. In that artificial quietness there is a response—obviously satisfying, otherwise you would reject it. Your prayer is satisfying, and therefore it is what you yourself have created. It is your own projection that helps you out—that is one type of prayer. Then there is the deliberative type of prayer, to make the mind quiet, receptive and open. How can the mind be open when it is conditioned by tradition, the background of the past? Openness implies understanding, the capacity to follow the imponderable. When the mind is held, tethered to a belief, it cannot be open. When it is deliberately opened, obviously any answer it receives is a projection of itself. Only when the mind is unconditioned, when it knows how to deal with each problem as it arises—only then is there no longer a problem. As long as the background continues, it must create a problem; as long as there is continuity, there must be ever-increasing turmoil and misery. Receptivity is the capacity to be open, without condemnation or justification, to what is; and it is that from which you try to escape through prayer.

IV

Surely, there is great confusion everywhere, not only within ourselves individually, but also in the world and among our so-called leaders. When there is confusion, there is a desire to find someone who will lead us out of our difficulties, and we turn to some kind of authority. We turn the responsibility over to our leaders, or seek a pattern of action, or look to the past or to the future to try to find out what ought to be done. Our morality is based on the pattern of yesterday or the ideal of tomorrow; and when tradition and the ideal of the future both fail, we turn to some authority. Because, most of us want security, we want some kind of refuge from all this turmoil, and we seek it in morality according to a pattern of the past, or in some sort of ideal; we cling to an example hoping to see our way out of our confusion, out of our uncertainty. Our ideal is a projection of ourselves created by the interpretation of various books, and our whole intention and purpose is to find something—a person, an idea, or a system—that will lead us out of this confusion. So, being confused, being uncertain, we seek external or inward authority and spend our energies in trying to conform ourselves either to the pattern of tradition or the ideal of what should be. Obviously, conformity at any level denies intelligence, which is the capacity to adjust, the capacity of quick response to challenge; and when that intelligence is not functioning, then we conform to a pattern, to authority. That is what is happening in the world at present, is it not? We are confused individually, and being confused, being insecure in ourselves, we turn to somebody. To find out, is it not necessary to be insecure, to be uncertain? Can you find anything if you are certain? Is it not essential to be uncertain to

discover reality, or what you will? There must be this state of uncertainty, this state of constant enquiry—not to find a result, but to enquire into each incident, each thought and feeling as it arises, which is to understand experience from moment to moment.

So, being confused, being uncertain, is not the following of a pattern detrimental to intelligence, to real inward integrity? Because, the pattern, the system, eventually leads to security; and how can a person who is psychologically secure ever find anything? Obviously, you must be physically secure; but physical security is destroyed as long as we are seeking psychological security. Surely, the desire for psychological security prevents creative response to life, which is intelligence. So, our problem is obviously not the substitution of one pattern for another, but how to be free of patterns, so that we can respond to every challenge anew. This is reality, is it not?—reality is to understand every moment of life as it is, without interpreting it according to our past experience. A mind that is bound by authority, whether its own or that of another, a mind that is conforming, imitating, following a particular pattern of action—how can such a mind be capable of understanding the real, of understanding what is at every moment of thought and feeling? The mind that is burdened with authority, with confusion, with discipline, obviously cannot find that which is free. Can a mind that is disciplined, controlled, subjugated, ever be free? Can a wrong means lead to a right end? To discover the real, the mind must be free at the beginning, not at some ultimate end. How can there be freedom for the mind that is conforming, that is merely imitating, following a certain course of action? And the mind will follow patterns of action, it will discipline itself, it will conform, as long as there is fear of psychological uncertainty. Physically you must have clothes, food,

shelter; but when there is psychological certainty, does it not exclude enquiry and so discovery? Surely, discovery is possible only in freedom, not in a course of action disciplined according to a pattern.

So, our enquiry is about not what is discipline, or what system or course of action to follow, but how to free the mind from the fear of being insecure. Is it not essential for the mind to be insecure? Obviously, only in insecurity can there be understanding of what is false. It requires a certain alertness, the non-acceptance of any authority. So, a mind that desires to understand reality must be free at the very beginning from all compulsion, inward or outward; that is, it must be in a state of uncertainty, not tethered to any particular belief or ideal which is merely a refuge. Only then, surely, is the mind carefree, aloof, happy, and only such a mind is capable of understanding that which is true. The capacity to understand requires freedom from conformity, which is freedom from fear. After all, we conform because we do not know, and we are afraid; but is it not a fact that not-knowing is essential for the unknown to be? If you observe you will see how the mind is constantly moving from the known to the known; but only when the mind is free from the known is it possible to receive the unknown, which means it must be entirely free from all sense of conformity, authority or imitation. The major calamity of modern civilization is that we are like so many gramophone records repeating what is said in the books, whether it is the Koran, the Bible, or what you will. Surely, a mind that repeats is not really in search of understanding, for it is incapable of being uncertain; and uncertainty is essential in order to find.

Question: Why don't you participate in politics or in social reform?

KRISHNAMURTI: Have you noticed how politics and social reform have become extraordinarily predominant in our lives at the present time? All our newspapers and most of the magazines, except the purely escapist ones, are full of politics, economics, and other problems. Have you ever asked yourself why they are that way, why human beings are giving such extraordinary importance to politics, economics, and social reform? Reforms are obviously necessary because of the economic, social and political confusion and the general deterioration of the state of man following the two wars. So, crowds gather round political leaders; people line the streets, watching them as though they were strange animals trying to solve the problem on the economic, social or political level, independent of the total process of man. Are these problems to be tackled separately, unrelated to the whole psychological problem of man? You may have a perfect system that you think will solve the economic problems of the world, but another will also have a perfect system; and the two systems, representing two different ideologies, will fight each other. As long as you are fighting over ideas, systems, there cannot be a true, radical revolution, there cannot be fundamental social transformation. Ideas do not transform people. What brings about transformation is freedom from ideas. Revolution based on ideas is no longer revolution, but merely a continuation of the past in a modified state. Obviously, that is not revolution.

The questioner wants to know why I don't take part in politics or in social reform. Surely, if you can understand the total process of man, then you are dealing with the fundamental issues, not merely trimming particular branches of the tree. But most of us are not interested in the entire problem. We are concerned merely with reconciliation, superficial adjustment, not with the funda-

mental understanding of man as a total process. It is very much easier to be an expert on one particular level. The experts on the economic or political level leave the psychological level to other experts, and so we become slaves to experts; we are sacrificed by experts for an idea. So, there can be fundamental revolution only in understanding the total process of yourself, not as an individual opposed to the mass, to society, but as an individual interrelated with society; because without you there is no society, without you there is no relationship with another. There is no revolution, no fundamental transformation, as long as we do not understand ourselves. Reformers and so-called revolutionists are really factors of retrogression in society. A reformer tries to patch up the present society, or create a new one, on the basis of an ideology, and his idea is the conditioned response to a pattern; and such revolution, based on an ideology, can never produce a fundamental, radical transformation in social relationships. What we are concerned with is not reformation or modified continuity, which you call revolution, but the fundamental transformation of man in his relationship with man; and as long as that basic change does not take place in the individual, we cannot produce a new social order. That fundamental transformation does not depend on belief, on religious organizations, or on any political or economic system: it depends on your understanding of yourself in relationship with another. That is the real revolution that must take place, and then you as an individual will have an extraordinary influence in society. But without that transformation, merely to talk about revolution or to sacrifice yourself for a so-called practical idea—which is not really sacrifice at all—, is obviously mere repetition, which is retrogression.

Question : Do you believe in reincarnation and karma ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Now I suppose you will settle back in your seats and feel comfortable. What do you mean by 'believe', and why do you want to believe? Is belief necessary to find out what is true? To find out what is true, you must approach life afresh, you must have the capacity to see things anew; but the mind that is cradled in belief is obviously incapable of discovering what is new. So, before you can discover whether there is reincarnation or not, you must find out if your mind is free from belief. Most of us believe because it is convenient, because it is satisfying; in it there is a great deal of hope. It is like taking some drug or narcotic and feeling pacified. Such a belief is a projection of our own desire. So, to find out the truth of any matter, obviously there must be freedom from hypothesis, from belief, from any form of conclusion—whether of Buddha, Christ, yourself, or your grandmother. You must approach it afresh, and only then are you capable of discovering what is true. Belief is an impediment to reality, and that is a very difficult pill to swallow for most of us. We are not seeking reality; we want gratification, and belief gives us gratification, it pacifies us. So, we are essentially seeking gratification, escaping from the problem, from pain and suffering. Therefore we are not really seeking the truth. To find the truth, there must be the direct experiencing of sorrow, pain, and pleasure, but not through a screen of belief.

So, similarly, let us find out what you mean by reincarnation—the truth of it, not what you like to believe, not what someone has told you, or what your teacher has said. Surely, it is the truth that liberates, not your own conclusion, your own opinion. Now, what do you mean by reincarnation? To reincarnate,

to be reborn—what do you mean by that? What is it that actually comes into birth again?—not what you believe or do not believe. Please put all that aside, it is only childish stuff. Let us find out what it is that comes back again or reincarnates. To find that out, you must first know what it is that you are. When you say, 'I shall be reborn', you must know what the 'I' is. That is the question, is it not? I am not dodging it. Don't think this is a clever move of mine. You will see the problem clearly as we proceed, as we explore. You say, 'I shall be reborn'. What is the 'I' that is to be reborn? Is the 'I' a spiritual entity, is the 'I' something continuous, is the 'I' something independent of memory, experience, knowledge? Either the 'I' is a spiritual entity, or it is merely a thought-process. Either it is something out of time which we call spiritual, not measurable in terms of time, or it is within the field of time, the field of memory, thought. It cannot be something else. Let us find out if it is beyond the measurement of time. I hope you are following all this. Let us find out if the 'I' is in essence something spiritual. Now, by 'spiritual' we mean, do we not?, something not capable of being conditioned, something that is not the projection of the human mind, something that is not within the field of thought, something that does not die. When we talk of a spiritual entity, we mean by that something which is not within the field of the mind, obviously. Now, is the 'I' such a spiritual entity? If it is a spiritual entity, it must be beyond all time, therefore it cannot be reborn or continued. Thought cannot think about it; because thought comes within the measure of time, thought is from yesterday, thought is a continuous movement, the response of the past; so thought is essentially a product of time. If thought can think about the 'I', then it is part of time: therefore that 'I' is not free of time.

therefore it is not spiritual—which is obvious. So, the 'I', the 'you' is only a process of thought; and you want to know whether that process of thought, continuing apart from the physical body, is born again, is reincarnated in a physical form. Now go a little further. That which continues—can it ever discover the real, which is beyond time and measurement? We are experimenting to discover truth, not exchanging opinions. That 'I', that entity which is a thought-process—can it ever be new? If it cannot, then there must be an ending to thought. Is not anything that continues inherently destructive? That which has continuity can never renew itself. As long as thought continues through memory, through desire, through experience, it can never renew itself; therefore, that which is continued cannot know the real. You may be reborn a thousand times, but you can never know the real; for only that which dies, that which comes to an end, can renew itself.

The other part of the question is whether I believe in *karma*. What do you mean by the word *karma*? To do, to act, to be. Let us try to find out in spite of old women's tales. *Karma* implies, does it not?, cause and effect—action based on cause, producing a certain effect; action born out of conditioning, producing further results. So *karma* implies cause and effect. And are cause and effect static, are cause and effect ever fixed? Does not effect become cause also? So there is no fixed cause or fixed effect. Today is a result of yesterday, is it not? Today is the outcome of yesterday, chronologically as well as psychologically; and today is the cause of tomorrow. So cause is effect, and effect becomes cause—it is one continuous movement, there is no fixed cause or fixed effect. If there were a fixed cause and a fixed effect, there would be specialization; and is not specialization death? Any species that spe-

cializes obviously comes to an end. The greatness of man is that he cannot specialize. He may specialize technically, but in structure he cannot specialize. An acorn seed is specialized—it cannot be anything but what it is. But the human being does not end completely. There is the possibility of constant renewal, he is not limited by specialization. As long as we regard the cause, the background, the conditioning, as unrelated to the effect, there must be conflict between thought and the background. So the problem is much more complex than whether to believe in reincarnation or not, because the question is how to act, not whether you believe in reincarnation or in karma. That is absolutely irrelevant. Your action is merely the outcome of certain causes, and that action modifies future action—therefore there is no escape from conditioning.

So, to put our problem differently, can action ever bring about freedom from this chain of cause-effect? I have done something in the past, I have had experience, which obviously conditions my response today; and today's response conditions tomorrow. That is the whole process of karma, cause and effect; and obviously, though it may temporarily give pleasure, such a process of cause and effect ultimately leads to pain. That is the real crux of the matter: Can thought be free? Thought, action, that is free does not produce pain, does not bring about conditioning. That is the vital point of this whole question. So, can there be action unrelated to the past? Can there be action not based on idea? Idea is the continuation of yesterday in a modified form, and that continuation will condition tomorrow, which means action based on idea can never be free. As long as action is based on idea, it will inevitably produce further conflict. Can there be action unrelated to the past? Can there be action without the burden of experience, the knowledge of yester-

day? As long as action is the outcome of the past, action can never be free; and only in freedom can you discover what is true. What happens is that, as the mind is not free, it cannot act; it can only react; and reaction is the basis of our action. Our action is not action, but merely the continuation of reaction, because it is the outcome of memory, of experience, of yesterday's response.

So, the question is, can the mind be free from its conditioning? Surely, that is implied in this question of karma and reincarnation. As long as there is continuity of thought, action must be limited; and such action creates opposition, conflict, and karma—the response of the past in conjunction with the present, creating a modified continuity. So, a mind which has continuity, which is based on continuity—can such a mind be free? If it cannot be free, is it possible for continuity to cease? This is a most important question. To discover whether the mind can ever be free from the background implies a tremendous enquiry. Is not the mind based on the background? Is not thought founded upon the past? So, can thought ever free itself from the past? All that thought can do is to come to an end—but obviously not through compulsion, not through effort, not through any form of discipline, control or subjugation. As an observer, see the truth of what it means for thought to come to an end. See the truth, the significance of it, and the false response is removed. That is what we are trying to do in answering this particular question. When there is action not based on idea or on the past, then the mind is silent, absolutely silent. In that silence, action is free from idea. You will want an answer to the question, whether I believe in reincarnation. Do you know any wiser, if I say "I do not believe in it"; do not believe in it; confused about it.

words of explanation indicates a petty mind, a stupid mind. Examine the whole process of yourself. That examination can take place only in relationship; and to discover the truth in any relationship there must be a state of constant watchfulness, constant, passive alertness. That will show you the truth, for which you need no confirmation from anybody. As long as thought continues, there can be no reality; as long as thought continues as the yesterday, there must be confusion and conflict. Only when the mind is still, passively watchful, is it possible for the real to be.

Question : Why are you against nationalism ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Aren't you against nationalism? Why are you a nationalist? Is not nationalism, calling yourself English, Tamil, or God knows what else, one of the fundamental reasons for war, for the appalling destruction and misery in the world? What is this process of identifying yourself with a group, with a particular country, whether economically, socially or politically? What is the reason for calling yourself a man of Ceylon, an Indian, a German, an American, a Russian, or whatever it is? Social conditioning and economic pressure make you identify yourself with a group. That is one factor. But why do you identify yourself with something?—that is the problem. You identify yourself with the family, with an idea, or with what you call God. Why do you identify yourself with something that you consider great? I live in a little village, I am nobody; but if I call myself a Hindu, if I identify myself with a certain class or caste, then I am somebody. Psychologically I am nobody—empty, insufficient, lonely, poor; but if I identify myself with something great, I become great. (Laughter). Don't laugh it off, this

is what you are actually doing—you call it nationalism, for which you sacrifice everything. A sovereign government must always be on the defensive against attack by some enemy; but you are willing to destroy yourself for an idea, which is your desire to be something great. Actually, you are not great, you are still what you were, only you call yourself a big man. Nationalism is false; like belief, it divides people; and as long as you are nationalistic, you cannot have physical security.

Question : What do you mean when you say that the thinker and the thought are one?

KRISHNAMURTI : This is a serious question, and you will have to be a little attentive. Now, are we not aware that there is the thinker apart from the thought, that the thinker is an entity separate from the process of thought? Because, the thinker is operating on thought, trying to control, subjugate, modify, or even find a substitute for thought. So, we say there is the thinker separate from thought. Now, is that so? Is the thinker separate from thought? If he is, why is he separate, what has brought about this separation? Is it so in reality, or is it an illusion? Is there actually a thinker separate from thought, or only thought separating itself as the thinker? Surely, thought has created the thinker: the thinker is not beyond thought, the thinker is the product of thought. So, the idea that the thinker is separate from thought, is false. It is thought that makes the thinker; and if there were no capacity to think at all, there would be no thinker. The thinker comes into being through thought; and why has this separation taken place? Obviously, for the simple reason that thought is constantly changing; that is, recognizing itself to be in transformation, in change, in constant flux,

thought creates an entity, the thinker, to give itself permanency. So desire for permanency creates the thinker. Obviously, thoughts are impermanent; but the entity, 'the thinker', feels himself to be permanent. Actually, there is no thinker at all: there is only thought creating a permanent entity because there is fear of impermanency. Therefore, it is an illusion. Most of us think this false process is a real process, and, because there is the thinker and the thought, because there is the experiencer who is always experiencing, there is no integration. There is integration only when thought does not create the thinker, which means that thought does not identify itself as 'my' thought, 'my' achievement, 'my' experience—for it is this 'my' that separates the thought from the thinker. When there is the experience of integration between thought and the thinker, then there is a fundamental revolution in thinking. Then there is no entity dominating or controlling thought, there is no longer the idea of a 'me' becoming something, growing more perfect, more virtuous. The complete integration is when there is only the thought to be understood through right meditation. There is no time now to discuss what is right meditation, we will do it next Sunday—it requires a great deal of time; but integration, that complete revolution in thinking, can be understood only in relationship.

Question : Is belief in God necessary or helpful?

KRISHNAMURTI : As I said, belief in any form is a hindrance. A man who believes in God can never find God. If you are open to reality, there can be no belief in reality. If you are open to the unknown, there can be no belief in it. After all, belief is a form of self-protection, and only a petty mind can believe in God. Look at the belief of the aviators

during the war, who said God was their companion as they were dropping bombs! So you believe in God when you kill, when you are exploiting people. You worship God and go on ruthlessly extorting money, supporting the army—yet you say you believe in mercy, compassion, kindness. Obviously, such belief is a hindrance to the understanding of reality. All belief in any form is a hindrance, including your belief in God. Your belief is a hindrance to the discovery of the real because it is based on an idea or patterned after a tradition. As long as belief exists, there can never be the unknown; you cannot think about the unknown, thought cannot measure it. The mind is the product of the past, it is the result of yesterday; and can such a mind be open to the unknown? It can only project an image, but that projection is not real; so your god is not God, it is an image of your own making, an image of your own gratification. There can be reality only when the mind understands the total process of itself and comes to an end. When the mind is completely empty—only then is it capable of receiving the unknown. The mind is not purged until it understands the content of relationship, its relationship with property, with people; until it has established the right relationship with everything. Until it understands the whole process of conflict in relationship, the mind cannot be free. Only when the mind is wholly silent, completely inactive, not projecting, when it is not seeking and is utterly still—only then that which is eternal and timeless comes into being. This is not speculation, something which you can learn from another, it is not sentiment or sensation—it is a thing that has to be experienced. You cannot experience it as long as the mind is active. Silence of the mind is not achieved by action, it is not a thing to be gone after: it comes only when conflict ceases. To understand one's conflict

in relationship is the beginning of wisdom; and when the mind is tranquil, that which is eternal comes into being.

January 15, 1950

V

This is the last talk, and it will be more or less a summary of what we have been discussing here for the last four or five weeks.

It must seem very odd to most of us that life has become such a struggle at all levels of existence—not only physically, but psychologically as well; inwardly as well as outwardly. We seem to be on a battle field of the world; and we have accepted, we have taken for granted, that conflict is the natural state of man. This conflict, this struggle, is the picture of man which so-called philosophers seem to have created; and we have accepted that as our normal life in relationship, not only with regard to property, but also in our relationship with people. There is this constant battle, individual and collective, between men and women, between man and man, between man and society; and there is also conflict between ideas, between the ideology of the left and of the right, between various beliefs, whether religious or secular, whether economic, social or political. So, there is constant division going on between man and man, not only outwardly, but inwardly.

Can we understand, can we actually create anything, in a state of conflict? Can you write a book, paint a picture, can you appreciate another human being, feel with him or love him, if there is conflict? Surely, conflict is the antithesis of understanding, and through conflict there can be no understanding at any time at any level. We have philosophically accepted that conflict

is inevitable, and perhaps we are entirely wrong to accept such a thesis, such an idea. Can understanding come from conflict, from warfare, from a proletarian revolution? To understand the structure of society and bring about a radical revolution, must you not understand what is actual, and not create the opposite and thus bring about conflict? Does conflict bring about a synthesis? To understand, surely, we must see, examine, what is actually, and not bring in other ideas about it; obviously, only then is it possible to solve the problem. As long as we approach the problem with ideas, with a conclusion, with opinions, with belief, with schemes, with systems of any kind, surely it prevents understanding. There are the problems of starvation, of unemployment, of war, to be solved. What is actually happening? The systems, based on left or right ideologies, are setting man against man; and in the meantime, there is still starvation. So, systems, ideologies, obviously do not solve the problem; yet we are fighting each other over ideas and particular systems. Surely, we must approach the problem without any conclusions of the past; for it is obvious that conclusions prevent understanding of the problem.

So, we can see that conflict at any level indicates deterioration—it is a sign of the disintegration of society as well as of the individual. If we see, not theoretically but actually, that conflict invariably prevents understanding, that through conflict you can never bring about harmony, surely then our approach to the problem is entirely different, is it not? Then our attitude undergoes a fundamental change. Up to now, our approach to the problem has created other problems, mounting sorrow and pain, which are ever the result of conflict and lack of understanding of the problem; and understanding can come only when there is no conflict. If I want to understand you, there

must not be any conflict; on the contrary, I must look at you, I must observe you, I must study you, not with previous conclusions, schemes or systems. Those are all prejudices, and prejudice prevents understanding. I must have a very clear mind, undimmed by any prejudice, any previous knowledge. Only such a mind is capable of understanding the problem, and in that approach lies the solution. The purgation of the mind, surely, is the first requirement in understanding the problem. The mind which is constantly in conflict, grappling, must be free from its own conditioning to meet the problem, whether economic, personal, or social.

So, what is important is how we approach any problem. It is essential that we see very clearly the relationship which creates conflict. It is the lack of right relationship that brings about conflict; and it is therefore essential that we understand conflict in relationship, the whole process of our thought and action. Obviously, if we do not understand ourselves in relationship, whatever society we create, whatever ideas, opinions we may have, will only bring about further mischief and further misery. Therefore, the understanding of the whole process of oneself in relationship with society is the first step in understanding the problem of conflict. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom; because, you are the world, you are not separate from the world. Society is your relationship with another, you have created it; and the solution lies through your own understanding of that relationship, the interaction between you and society. Without understanding yourself, to seek for a solution is utterly useless—it is merely an escape. Therefore, what is important is understanding relationship. It is relationship which causes conflict, and that relationship cannot be understood unless we have the capacity

to be passively watchful; then, in that passive alertness, in that awareness, there comes understanding.

Question: What is the simple life, and how can I live a simple life in the modern world?

KRISHNAMURTI: The simple life has to be discovered, is it not so? There is no pattern for a simple life. Having few clothes, a loin cloth and a begging bowl, does not indicate a simple life. It must be discovered. Surely, to make a pattern for a simple life does not bring about simplicity; on the contrary, it creates complexity. What do we mean by the simple life? Having hut few clothes, going about half-naked, possessing little—does that indicate the simple life? Is not life much more complex than that? Obviously, one must have but few things. It is silly, foolish, stupid, to have many things and depend on them. Man has many possessions and he clings to them—his property, his title, and so on. But is it the simple life for a man to have innumerable beliefs, or even one belief? Dependence on systems, authority, the urge to become, to attain, to acquire, to imitate, to conform, to discipline oneself according to a particular pattern—is that the simple life? Does that indicate simplicity? Surely, simplicity must begin, not merely in the expression of outward things, but much deeper. The man who is simple has no conflict. Conflict indicates an escape towards the more or towards the less. That is, conflict indicates acquisitiveness, the desire to become something more or something less; and a man who wants to become something, is he a simple entity? You despise the man who is trying to acquire wealth, possessions, and you appreciate the man who is supposed not to be interested in worldly things but who is striving to become virtuous, or to become like

Buddha, Christ, or to follow a certain pattern—you will say he is a marvellous entity. Surely, the man who is striving to become something in the world is the same as the man who wants to be spiritual. Both are united in one desire—to become someone or something, either respectable or so-called spiritual.

Surely, the simple life is not something theatrical. It can be discovered in daily life; in this rotten world, which after two dreadful wars is perhaps preparing for a third, we can live simply, not only outwardly but inwardly. Why do we give such importance to the outward manifestations of simplicity? Why do we inevitably begin at the wrong end? Why don't we begin at the right end, which is the psychological? Surely, we must begin at the psychological end to find what is the simple life, because it is the inner that creates the outer. It is inward insufficiency that makes people cling to property, to beliefs; it is this sense of inward insufficiency that forces us to accumulate goods, clothes, knowledge, virtue. Surely, in that way we can only create much more mischief, much more harm. It is extraordinarily difficult to have a simple mind—not the so-called intellectual mind of the educated, but the simplicity that comes when we understand something, that simplicity that perceives the problem of what is. Surely, we cannot understand anything when our mind is complex. I don't know if you have noticed that when you are worried over a problem, when you are concerned about something, you do not see anything very clearly, it is all out of focus. Only when the mind is simple and vulnerable is it possible to see things clearly, in their true proportion. So simplicity of the mind is essential for simplicity of life. The monastery is not the solution. Simplicity comes when the mind is not attached, when the mind is not acquiring, when the mind accepts what is. It really means free-

dom from the background, from the known, from the experience it has acquired. Only then is the mind simple, and then only is it possible to be free. There cannot be simplicity as long as one belongs to any particular religion, to any particular class or society, to any dogma, either of the left or of the right. To be simple inwardly, to be clear, to be vulnerable, is to be like a flame without smoke; and therefore you cannot be simple without love. Love is not an idea, love is not thought. It is only in the cessation of thinking that there is the possibility to know that simplicity which is vulnerable.

Question : I find that loneliness is the underlying cause of many of my problems. How can I deal with it?

KRISHNAMURTI: What do you mean by loneliness? Are you actually aware that you are lonely? Surely, loneliness is not a state of aloneness. Very few of us are alone; we don't want to be alone. It is essential to understand that aloneness is not isolation. Surely, there is a difference between being alone, and isolation. Isolation is the sense of being enclosed, the sense of having no relationships, a feeling that you have been cut off from everything. That is entirely different from being alone, which is to be extraordinarily vulnerable. When we are lonely, a feeling of fear, anxiety, the ache of finding oneself in isolation, comes over one. You love somebody, you feel that without that somebody you are lost; so that person becomes essential to you in order for you not to feel the sense of isolation. So, you use the person in order to escape from what you are. That is why we try to establish relationship, a communion with another, or establish a contact with things, property—just so that we feel alive; we acquire furniture, dresses, cars, we seek to accumulate know-

ledge, or become addicted to love. By loneliness we mean that state which comes upon the mind, a state of isolation, a state in which there is no contact, no relationship, no communion with anything. We are afraid of it, we call it painful; and being afraid of what we are, of our actual state, we run away from it, using so many ways of escape—God, drink, the radio, amusements—, anything to get away from that sense of isolation. And are not our actions, both in individual relationship and in relationship with society, an isolating process? Is not the relationship of father, mother, wife, husband, an isolating process for us at the present time? Is not that relationship almost always—a relationship based on mutual need? So, the process of self-isolation is simple—you are all the time seeking, in your relationships, an advantage for yourself. This isolating process is going on continually, and when awareness of isolation comes upon us through our own activities, we want to run away from it; so we go to the temple, or back to a book, or turn on the radio, or sit in front of a picture and meditate—anything to get away from what is.

So, we come to the actual question which is the desire to escape. What do you fear, why are you afraid of the unknown, that insufficiency in yourself, that emptiness? If you are afraid, why do you not look into it? Why should you be afraid of losing what you have, of losing association, contact? What exactly do you know, with your pretensions of knowledge? Your knowledge is but memory; you don't know the living, you know the past—the dead things, the decadent things. So, is it not our trouble that we never find what is? We never face the conflict of our insufficiency—we keep smothering it down and suppressing it, running away from it, and we don't know what is. Surely, when we approach it without any fear or condemnation,

then, we come to find the truth of it; and it may be extraordinarily more significant than the significance we give it through fear. Through fear of insufficiency, the mind is operating upon thought—the mind never looks at it; and it is only when we have the capacity to look at thought that there is the possibility of understanding what has made that thought, and thus is revealed to us the whole process of escape from what is. Then loneliness is transformed, it becomes aloneness; and that aloneness is a state of vulnerability which is capable of receiving the unknown, the imponderable, the measureless. Therefore, to understand that state of vulnerability, we must understand the whole process of thinking—which means that we must look at it and see its extraordinary qualities. That state cannot be accepted verbally; it must be experienced.

Question: You lay great emphasis on being aware of our conditioning. How can I understand my mind?

KRISHNAMURTI: Is not conditioning inevitable—inevitable in the sense that it is actually taking place all the time? You condition your children as Buddhists, Sinhalese, Tamil, Englishmen, Chinese, Communists, and so on. There is a constant impingement of influences—economic, climatic, social, political, religious—acting all the time. Look at yourself: you are either a Buddhist, Sinhalese, Hindu, Christian, or Capitalist. That is the whole process—the mind is constantly being conditioned, which means the mind is a result of the past, is founded upon the past. Thought is the response of the past. Mind is the past, mind is part of the past; and the past is tradition, morality. So, action is patterned on the past, or on the future as the ideal. This is the actual state of all who are conditioned. We

are the product of the environment, social, economic, or what you will. What you believe is the product of what your father and society have put into you. If they had not put into you the idea of Buddhism, surely you would be something else—Roman Catholic, Protestant, or Communist. Your beliefs are the result of your environment, and these beliefs are also created by you; because you are the product of the past, and the past in conjunction with the present creates the present social entity. So, your mind is conditioned; that conditioned mind meets the challenge, the stimulus, and invariably responds according to its conditioning, and this is what creates a problem. So, a conditioned mind meeting the challenge creates a problem, because the response of a conditioned mind to the challenge is inadequate. Inadequacy of the conditioned response creates the problem. The problem is always new, the challenge is always new; challenge implies newness, otherwise it is not challenge. So, the conditioned mind meeting the challenge creates a problem, which brings on conflict.

Now, if you ask, 'Can I be free from conditioning?', your question has validity, not otherwise. As long as the mind is conditioned according to a pattern, it will always respond according to that pattern. There are those who say that the mind cannot be unconditioned, that it is an impossibility; therefore, they substitute a new form of conditioning for the old. Instead of the capitalists, there is the communist; instead of the Roman Catholic, the Protestant or the Buddhist. That is what is actually happening now all over the world. They speak of revolution; it is not revolution, but merely substitution of ideas. Ideas don't produce revolution; they only produce a modified continuity, not revolution. So, there are those who say the mind cannot be unconditioned, but can only be re-conditioned in a different way. The

very assertion implies conditioning. If you say that it can, or that it cannot, you are already conditioned. Therefore, what is important is to find out if the mind can be unconditioned—completely, not superficially or momentarily. How can we do it?

Now, why do you call yourselves Buddhists? You have been told from childhood that you are Buddhists—and why do you accept it and hold on to it? If you can understand that, you will be free of it. What would happen if you didn't hold on to it? If you didn't call yourself a Buddhist, you would feel that you were left out and isolated. So, you do it for economic reasons—that is one factor. Another factor is that you identify yourself with something larger, otherwise you feel lost. You are nobody; but when you say you are a Buddhist, you are somebody, it gives you coloration. So, your desire to be somebody, your desire to be identified with something great, conditions you. The desire to be somebody is the very essence of conditioning. If you had no desire to be somebody, you would not be conditioned in the deeper sense. Surely, being what is is the beginning of virtue; contentment is the understanding of what is. The desire to be something invariably conditions thought, and therefore creates a problem ever deeper and wider, increasing conflict and misery. To be free from conditioning is very simple—experiment with it. When you don't want to be an artist, a Master, a minister, a great, wise, or learned person, then you are nobody. That is the fact, but we don't like to accept it; so we cling to possessions, furniture, books, property. Instead of indulging in pretensions, why not just be small? Then you will see that the mind is extraordinarily pliable, capable of quickly responding to challenge. Such a mind is capable of responding anew to the challenge. Surely, that is clear. Conditioning is not only superficial, in the upper layer of the

mind—it is also in the deeper layers ; in both the bidden as well as the upper content of the mind there is the desire to be somebody. It is the desire to be somebody, to seek a result, that brings about conditioning ; and a conditioned mind can never be revolutionary, it is merely acting according to a pattern—it is somnambulant, not revolutionary. Revolution comes into being when the mind is free, when it does not act according to the past and is aware of its conditioning. Only when the mind is quiet can it be free.

Question : What is right meditation ?

KRISHNAMURTI : This is a very complex subject, and it requires a great deal of understanding. Let us go into the question. You and I are going to find out what is right meditation, which means that you and I are going to meditate. How do we understand anything ? What is the state of the mind for understanding ? We are going to find out the many implications of what is meditation. To understand something, you must have communion with it—there must be no barriers. There must be complete integration if you want to understand something new. How would you approach it ? You will have to look at it, not condemn or justify it. To understand the problem, the mind must be passively watchful. Meditation is the process of understanding, it is the passive state which brings about discovery of truth. I have discussed meditation before, but now we are discussing it anew. The mind must be extremely quiet to understand deeply. If I want to understand something, my mind must be silent. If I have a problem and want really to understand it, I must not go to it with a worried and agitated mind. I must go with a free mind ; for only a passive, alert mind can understand. A mind that is

capable of being silent is in a position to receive the truth. Because, you don't know what truth is ; if you know the truth, it is not truth. Truth is utterly new, free. It cannot be approached through preconceptions, it is not the experience of another. So, to discover truth, reality, the mind must be absolutely still. That is a requisite for the understanding of any problem, political, economic, or mathematical.

So, it is essential for the mind to be quiet in order to understand. The mind is new only when it is quiet ; it is free, tranquil, only when it is not conditioned by the past. It is only then that the unknown is instinctively discovered. So, there must be freedom ; and a mind that is disciplined, regimented, is not a free mind, it is not still. Its function is conditioned when it is under discipline. Such a mind is made still by discipline, it is controlled, shaped to be still. For the mind to be really still, there must be freedom, not at the end, but at the beginning. A mind that is overburdened, or a disciplined mind, is incapable of understanding a problem. What brings about freedom ?—not a qualified freedom, prompted by desire. How does freedom come into being, so that the mind may receive the truth ? Such freedom can be only when there is virtue. At present, you are striving to become virtuous, and to become something obviously means another form of conditioning. When you strive to become non-violent, the actual process of striving is violence. That is, in trying to become non-violent you are imitating the ideal of non-violence, which is your own projection. So, the ideal is home-made, it is the outcome of your own violence. Being violent, you create the opposite ; but the opposite always contains its own opposite, therefore the ideal of non-violence must inevitably contain the element of violence—they are not different. So, the mind that is trying to become merciful, to be-

come humble, is conditioned, and therefore can never see the truth. Virtue is the understanding of what is without escape. You cannot understand what is if you resist it, because understanding requires freedom from conditioned response to what is; it not only requires freedom from condemnation and justification, but also from the whole process of terming, or giving a name. Virtue is a state of freedom, because virtue brings order and clarity. Virtue is free from becoming; it is the understanding of what is. Understanding is not a matter of time; but time is required to escape through the process of acquiring virtue. So, only the mind that is silent can receive the unknown; because, the unknown is immeasurable. That which is measured is not the unknown; it is known, therefore it is not true, not real. Freedom comes from virtue, not through discipline. A disciplined mind is an exclusive mind; and there is freedom only when each thought is completely understood without exclusion or distraction. What is called concentration is merely a process of exclusion, and the mind that knows how to exclude, to resist, is not a free mind. You cannot understand thought if you resist it. The mind must be free to meet each thought and understand it fully, and then you will see that thought as an accumulative process comes to an end.

There is also the question of making the mind still through various practices. Is not the thinker, the observer, the same as the thought which he observes? They are not two different processes, but one process. As long as there is the thinker as an observer apart from thought, there is no freedom. Meditation is the process of understanding the

thinker; meditation is the process of understanding the meditator—that is, understanding oneself at all levels as 'my house', 'my property', 'my wife', 'my beliefs', 'my knowledge', 'my acquisition', 'my work'. As long as the thinker is separate from thought, there must be conflict, there cannot be freedom. So, understanding the meditator is self-knowledge, which is what we have been doing this evening. The beginning of meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge, because we cannot be free without self-knowledge. Understanding yourself requires passive alertness. There must be freedom at the beginning, not at the end. Truth is not an ultimate end to be personally achieved; it is to be experienced, lived at every minute in relationship. The mind that is silent—not made silent—alone can perceive the immeasurable. The solution to the problem of bringing about quietness without compulsion lies in understanding relationship; therefore meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge, and self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom is not the accumulation of knowledge and experience; wisdom is not acquired from books, from ceremonies, or by compulsion. Wisdom comes into being only when there is freedom of the mind; and a still mind will find the timeless, which is the immeasurable come into being. That state is not a state of experience; it is not a state to be remembered. What you remember, you will repeat, and the immeasurable is not repeatable, it cannot be cultivated. The mind must be moved to receive it afresh each time; and a mind that accumulates knowledge, virtue, is incapable of receiving the eternal.

January 22, 1950

BROADCAST TALKS GIVEN IN COLOMBO, CEYLON.

ACTION

The problems that confront each one of us, and so the world, cannot be solved by politicians or by specialists. These problems are not the result of superficial causes and cannot be so considered. No problem, specially a human problem, can be solved at any one particular level. Our problems are complex; they can be solved only as a total process of man's response to life. The experts may give blue prints for planned action and it is not the planned actions that are going to save us but the understanding of the total process of man, which is yourself. The experts can only deal with problems on a single level, and so increase our conflicts and confusion.

It is disastrous to consider our complex human problem on a single particular level and allow the specialists to dominate our lives. Our life is a complex process which requires deep understanding of ourselves as thought and feeling. Without understanding ourselves, no problem, however superficial or however complex, can be understood. Without understanding ourselves, our relationship must inevitably lead to conflict and confusion. Without understanding ourselves, there can be no new social order. A revolution without self-knowledge is merely a modified continuation of the present state.

Self-knowledge is not a thing to be bought in books, nor is it the outcome of a long painful practice and discipline; but it is awareness, from moment to moment, of every thought and feeling as it arises in relationship. Relationship is not on an abstract ideological level, but an actuality, the relationship with property, with people and with ideas. Relationship implies existence; and

as nothing can live in isolation, to be is to be related. Our conflict is in relationship, at all the levels of our existence; and the understanding of this relationship, completely and extensively, is the only real problem that each one has. This problem cannot be postponed nor be evaded. The avoidance of it only creates further conflict and misery. The escape from it only brings about thoughtlessness which is exploited by the crafty and the ambitious.

Religion then is not belief, nor dogma, but the understanding of truth that is to be discovered in relationship, from moment to moment. Religion that is belief and dogma, is only an escape from the reality of relationship. The man who seeks God, or what you will, through belief which he calls religion, only creates opposition, bringing about separation which is disintegration. Any form of ideology, whether of the right or of the left, of this particular religion or of that, sets man against man—which is what is happening in the world.

The replacement of one ideology by another is not the solution to our problems. The problem is not which is the better ideology, but the understanding of ourselves as a total process. You might say that the understanding of ourselves takes infinite time and in the meanwhile the world is going to pieces. You think that if you have a planned action according to an ideology, then there is a possibility of bringing about, soon, a transformation in the world. If we look a little more closely into this, we will see that ideas do not bring people together at all. An idea may help to form a group, but that group is against another with a different idea and so on till ideas become more important than action. Ideologies,

beliefs, organized religions, separate people.

Humanity cannot be integrated by an idea, however noble and extensive that idea may be. For idea is merely a conditioned response; and a conditioned response, in meeting the challenge of life, must be inadequate, bringing with it conflict and confusion. Religion that is based on idea, cannot bring man together. Religion as the experience of some authority may bind a few people together but it will breed inevitably antagonism; the experience of another is not true, however great the experiencer may be. Truth can never be the product of self-projected authority. The experience of a guru, of a teacher, of a saint, of a saviour, is not the truth which you have to discover. The truth of another is not truth. You may repeat the verbal expression of truth to another; but, that becomes a lie in the process of repetition.

The experience of another is not valid in understanding reality. But, the organized religions throughout the world are based on the experience of another and, therefore, are not liberating man but only blinding him to a particular pattern which sets man against man. Each one of us has to start anew, afresh; for what we are, the world is. The world is not different from you and me. This little world of our problems, extended, becomes the world and the problems of the world.

We despair of our understanding in relation to the vast problems of the world. We do not see that it is not a problem of mass action, but of the awakening of the individual to the world in which he lives, and to resolve the problems of his world, however limited. The mass is an abstraction which is exploited by the politician, by one who has an ideology. The mass is actually you and I and another. When you and I and another are hypnotized by a word, then we become the mass,

which is still an abstraction, for the word is an abstraction. The mass action is an illusion. This action is really the idea about an action of the few which we accept in our confusion and despair. Out of our confusion and despair, we choose our guide whether political or religious; and they must inevitably, because of our choice, be also in confusion and despair. They may put on an air of certainty and all-knowing-ness; but, actually, as they are the guides of the confused, they must be equally confused; or, they will not be the guides. In the world, where the leader (guide) and the led (guided) are confused, to follow the pattern or an ideology, knowingly or unknowingly, is to breed further conflict and misery.

The individual then is important, not his idea or whom he follows, his country or his belief. You are important, not to what ideology or nation you belong, to what colour and creed; the ideology is only a projection of our own conditioning. These conditionings may, at one level, be useful as knowledge; but at another level, at the deeper levels of existence, they become extremely harmful and destructive. As these are your own projections—the religions and the ideologies, the nationalism and the patterns—any action based on them must be the activity of the dog chasing its tail. For all ideals are home-made. They are the result of your own projection and they do not reveal truth.

It is only when each one of us realizes the present structure of existence, the structure of self-projected ideals and conclusions, then only is there a possibility of freeing ourselves and looking at the problem anew. The crisis, the impending disasters, cannot be dissolved by another set of self-projected ideologies, but only when you, as an individual, realize the truth of this and so begin to understand the total process of your thought and feeling. The individual

the problem with conclusions, with explanations, which we call ideals. They are the means of postponing action. Idea is thought verbalized. Without the word, the symbol, the image, thought is not. Thought is response of memory, of experience, which are the conditioning influences. These influences are not only of the past but of the past in conjunction with the present. So, the past is always shadowing the present. Idea is the response of the past to the present; and so, idea is always limited, however extensive it may be. So, idea must always separate people.

The world is always close to catastrophe. But it seems to be closer now. Seeing this approaching catastrophe, most of us take shelter in idea. We think that this catastrophe, this crisis, can be solved by an ideology. Ideology is always an impediment to direct relationship which prevents action. We want peace only as an idea, but not as an actuality. We want peace on the verbal level which is only on the thinking level, though we proudly call it the intellectual level. But the word 'peace' is not peace. Peace can only be when the confusion which you and another make, ceases. We are attached to the world of ideas and not to peace. We search for new social and political patterns and not for peace; we are concerned with the reconciliation of effects and not in putting aside the cause of war. This search will bring only answers conditioned by the past. This conditioning is what we call knowledge, experience; and the new changing facts are translated, interpreted, according to this knowledge. So, there is conflict between what is and the experience that has been. The past which is knowledge, must ever be in conflict with the fact which is ever in the present. So, this will not solve the problem but will perpetuate the conditions which have created the problem.

We come to the problem with ideas about it, with conclusions and answers according to our prejudices. We interpose between ourselves and the problem the screen of ideology. Naturally the answer to the problem is according to the ideology, which only creates another problem without resolving that with which we began.

Relationship is our problem, and not the idea about relationship, not at any one particular level but at all the levels of our existence. This is the only problem we have. To understand relationship, we must come to it with freedom from all ideology, from all prejudice, not merely from the prejudice of the uneducated but also from the prejudice of knowledge. There is no such thing as understanding of the problem from past experience. Each problem is new. There is no such thing as an old problem. When we approach a problem which is always new, with an idea which is invariably the outcome of the past, our response is also of the past which prevents understanding the problem.

The search for an answer to the problem only intensifies it. The answer is not away from it but only in the problem itself. We must see the problem afresh and not through the screen of the past. The inadequacy of response to challenge creates the problem. This inadequacy has to be understood and not the challenge. We are eager to see the new and we cannot see it, as the image of the past prevents the clear perception of it. We respond to challenge only as Sinhalese or Tamilians, as Buddhists or as of the left or of the right; this invariably produces further conflict. So, what is important is not seeing the new but the removal of the old. When the response is inadequate to the challenge then only is there no conflict, no problem. This has to be seen in our daily life and not in the issues of newspapers.

Relationship is the challenge of everyday life. If you and I and another do not know how to meet each other, we are creating conditions that breed war. So, the world problem is your problem. You are not different from the world. The world is you. What you are the world is. You can save the world, which is yourself, only in understanding the relationship of your daily life and not through belief, called religion, of the left or of the right, or through any reform however extensive. The hope is not in the expert, in the ideology, or in the new leader; but it lies in you.

You might ask how you, living an ordinary life in a limited circle, could affect the present world-crisis. I do not think you will be able to. The present struggle is the outcome of the past which you and another have created. Until you and another radically alter the present relationship, you will only contribute to further misery. This is not over-simplification. If you go into it fully, you will see how your relationship with another, when extended, brings about world conflict and antagonism.

The world is you. Without the transformation of the individual which is you, there can be no radical revolution in the world. The revolution in social order without the individual transformation will only lead to further conflict and disaster. For, society is the relationship of you and me and another. Without radical revolution in this relationship, all effort to bring peace is only a reformation, however revolutionary, which is retrogression.

Relationship based on mutual need brings only conflict. However inter-dependent we are on each other, we are using each other for a purpose, for an end. With an end in view, relationship is not. You may use me and I may use you. In this usage, we lose contact. A society based on mutual usage is the foundation of violence. When we use another, we

have only the picture of the end to be gained. The end, the gain, prevents relationship, communion. In the usage of another, however gratifying and comforting it may be, there is always fear. To avoid this fear, we must possess. From this possession there arises envy, suspicion and constant conflict. Such a relationship can never bring about happiness.

A society whose structure is based on mere need, whether physiological or psychological, must breed conflict, confusion and misery. Society is the projection of yourself in relation with another, in which the need and the use are predominant. When you use another for your need, physically or psychologically, in actuality there is no relationship at all; you really have no contact with the other, no communion with the other. How can you have communion with the other, when the other is used as a piece of furniture, for your convenience and comfort? So, it is essential to understand the significance of relationship in daily life.

We do not understand relationship; the total process of our being, our thought, our activity, makes for isolation—which prevents relationship. The ambitious, the crafty, the believer, can have no relationship with another. He can only use another which makes for confusion and enmity. This confusion and enmity exist in our present social structure; they will exist also in any reformed society as long as there is no fundamental revolution in our attitude towards another human being. As long as we use another as a means towards an end, however noble, there will be inevitably violence and disorder.

If you and I bring about fundamental revolution in ourselves, not based on mutual need—either physical or psychological—then, has not our relationship to the other undergone a fundamental transformation? Our difficulty is that we have a pic-

ture of what the new organized society should be and we try to fit ourselves into that pattern. The pattern is obviously fictitious. But what is real is that which we are actually. In the understanding of what you are, which is seen clearly in the mirror of daily relationship, to follow the pattern only brings about further conflict and confusion.

The present social disorder and misery must work itself out. But you and I and another can and must see the truth of relationship and so start a new action which is not based on mutual need and gratification. Mere reformation of the present structure of society without altering fundamentally our relationship is retrogression. A revolution which maintains the usage of man towards an end however promising is productive of further wars and untold sorrow. The end is always the projection of our own conditioning. However promising and utopian it might be, the end can only be a means of further confusion and pain. What is important in all this is not the new patterns, the new superficial changes, but the understanding of the total process of man, which is yourself.

In the process of understanding yourself, not in isolation but in relationship, you will find that there is

a deep, lasting transformation in which the usage of another as a means for your own psychological gratification has come to an end. What is important is not how to act, what pattern to follow, or which ideology is the best, but the understanding of your relationship with another. This understanding is the only revolution, and not the revolution based on idea. Any revolution based on an ideology maintains man as a means only.

As the inner always overcomes the outer, without understanding the total psychological process, which is yourself, there is no basis for thinking at all. Any thought which produces a pattern of action, will only lead to further ignorance and confusion.

There is only one fundamental revolution. This revolution is not of idea; it is not based on any pattern of action. This revolution comes into being when the need for using another ceases. This transformation is not an abstraction, a thing to be wished for, but an actuality which can be experienced, as we begin to understand the way of our relationship. This fundamental revolution may be called love; it is the only creative factor in bringing about transformation in ourselves and so in society.

January 22, 1950

**KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS**

1950

(Verbatim Report)

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS

1950

(*Verbatim Report*)

SERIES IV -- NEW YORK & SEATTLE

Copyright 1950 by Krishnamurti Writings Inc.

Published by
KRISHNAMURTI WRITINGS INC.
OJAI, CALIFORNIA
MADRAS, INDIA
LONDON, ENGLAND

Translation and all rights reserved
Printed in India by G. S. Press, Madras

I

TALK IN NEW YORK

I think it is important to bear in mind that there is a difficulty in understanding each other. Most of us listen casually, and we hear only what we want to hear; we disregard that which is penetrating or disturbing, and listen only to the things that are pleasurable, satisfying. Surely, there can be no real understanding of anything if we listen only to those things which gratify and soothe us. It is quite an art to listen to everything without prejudice, without building up defences; and may I suggest that we try to set aside our acquired knowledge, our particular idiosyncracies and points of view, and listen to find out the truth of the matter. It is only the truth that really and fundamentally frees us—not speculations, not conclusions, but only the perception of what is true. The true is the factual, and we are incapable of looking at the factual when we approach it with our private conclusions, prejudices, and experiences. So, if I may suggest it, during these talks we should try to hear, not only what is being said verbally, but the inward content of it; we should try to discover the truth of the matter for ourselves.

Now, truth can be discovered only when we are not pursuing any form of distraction; and most of us want to be distracted. Life, with all its struggles, problems, wars, business crises and family quarrels, is a bit too much for us, so we want to be distracted, and we have probably come to this meeting in search of distraction. But distraction, whether outward or inward, will not help us to understand ourselves. Distraction—whether the distraction of politics, of religion, of knowledge, of amusement, or the distraction of pursuing so-called truth—, however stimulating for the time being,ulti-

mately dulls the mind, encloses, circumscribes and limits it. Distractions are both outward and inward. The outward ones we know fairly well; as we grow older we begin to recognize them if we are at all thoughtful. But though we may discard the obvious distractions, it is much more difficult to understand the inward ones; and if we merely make these meetings into a new form of distraction, a new stimulation, I am afraid they will have very little value in the understanding of oneself—which is of primary importance.

Therefore, one has to understand the whole process of distraction; because, as long as the mind is distracted, seeking a result, trying to escape through stimulation or so-called inspiration, it is incapable of understanding its own process. And, if we are to think out any of the innumerable problems that confront each one of us, it is essential to know the whole process of our own thinking, is it not? Self-knowledge is ultimately the only way of resolving our innumerable problems; and self-knowledge cannot possibly be a result, an outcome of stimulation or distraction. On the contrary, distraction, stimulation and so-called inspiration, merely take one away from the central issue. Surely, without knowing oneself fundamentally, radically, and deeply, without knowing all the layers of consciousness, both the superficial as well as the profound, there is no basis for thinking, is there? If I do not know myself in both the upper and the deeper layers of the mind, what basis have I for any thinking? And in order to know oneself, no form of distraction is helpful. Yet most of us are concerned with distractions. Our religious, political, social, and economic activities, our pursuit of various teachers with their particular idiosyncracies, our clamoring after what we call knowledge—these are all escapes, they are obviously distractions away

from the central issue of knowing oneself. Though it has often been said that it is essential to know oneself, we actually give very little time or thought to the matter; and without knowing oneself, whatever we think or do must inevitably lead to further confusion and misery.

So, it is essential in all things to understand the process of oneself; because, without knowing oneself, no human problem can be resolved. Any resolution of a problem without self-knowledge is merely distraction, leading to further misery, confusion, and struggle — this, when one thinks about it, is fairly obvious. Seeing the truth of that, how is it possible to know the whole content, the whole structure of oneself? I think this is a fundamental question which each one of us has to face; and in considering it together, you are not merely listening to me giving you a series of ideas, nor am I expounding a particular system or method. On the contrary, you and I are trying to find out together how it is possible to know oneself — the 'oneself' who is the actor, the observer, the thinker, the watcher. If I do not know the whole process of myself, mere conclusions, theories, speculations, are obviously of very little significance.

Now, to know myself, I must know my actions, my thoughts, my feelings; because, I can only know myself in action, not apart from action. I cannot know myself apart from my activities in relationship. My activities, my qualities, are myself. I can know the whole process of my thinking, the conscious as well as the unconscious, only in relationship — my relationship to ideas, to people, and to things, property, and money; and to study myself apart from relationship has very little meaning. It is only in my relationship to these things that I can know myself. To divide myself into the 'higher' and the 'lower' is absurd. To think that I am the 'higher self' directing or controlling my 'lower self', is a

theory of the mind; and without understanding the structure of the mind, merely to invent convenient theories is a process of escape from myself.

So, the important thing is to find out what my relationship is to people, to property, and to ideas; because, life is a process of relationship. Nothing can live in isolation, except theoretically; and to understand myself, I must understand the whole process of relationship. But the understanding of relationship becomes extremely difficult, and almost impossible, when I look into the mirror of relationship with a sense of condemnation, justification, or comparison. How can I understand relationship if I condemn, justify, or compare it with something? I can understand it only when I come to it anew, with a fresh mind, a mind which is not caught in the traditional background of condemnation and acceptance.

To understand myself is essential, because, whatever the problems, they are projected by me. I am the world, I am not independent of the world, and the world's problems are my own. To understand the problems around me, which are the projection of myself, I have to understand myself in relationship to everything; but there cannot be understanding if I begin by comparing, condemning, or justifying. Now, it is the nature of the mind to condemn, to justify, to compare; and when we see in the mirror of relationship our own reactions and idiosyncrasies, our instinctive response is to condemn or justify them. The understanding of this process of condemnation and justification is the beginning of self-knowledge — and without self-knowledge, we cannot go very far. We can invent a lot of theories and speculations, join various groups, follow teachers and Masters, perform rituals, gather into little cliques and feel superior to others — but all this leads nowhere, it is merely the immature

action of thoughtless people. To find out what is real, to discover whether or not there is reality, God, one must first understand oneself; because, whatever the conception one may have of reality or of God, it is merely a projection of oneself, which can obviously never be real. It is only when the mind is utterly tranquil—not forced to be tranquil, not compelled, not disciplined—that it is possible to find out what is real; and the mind can be still only in the understanding of its own structure. Only the real, that which is not a projection of the mind, can free the mind from all the tribulations, from all the problems that confront each one of us.

So, we must first see the importance, the necessity of understanding oneself; for without understanding oneself, no problem can be resolved, and the wars, the antagonisms, the envy and strife, will continue. A man who would really understand truth must have a mind that is quiet; and that quietness can come only through the understanding of himself. Tranquillity of the mind does not come through discipline, through control, through subjugation, but only when the problems, which are the projections of oneself, are completely understood. Only when the mind is quiet, when it is not projecting itself, is it possible for the real to be. That is, for reality to come into being, the mind must be quiet—not made quiet, not controlled, subjugated, or suppressed, but silent spontaneously because of its understanding of the whole structure of the 'me', with all its memories, limitations, and conflicts. When all this is completely and truly understood, the mind is quiet; and then only is it possible to know that which is real.

Some questions have been given to me, and I shall answer a few of them this morning; but before doing so, let me say that it is very easy to ask a question, hoping for an answer. I am afraid, however, that life has no

answer like 'yes' or 'no'. We have to discover the true answer for ourselves; and to discover the true answer, we must examine the problem. To examine the problem, especially a problem that concerns us intimately, is very difficult; for most of us approach it with a prejudice, with a desire to find a result, a satisfactory answer. So, in considering these questions, let us investigate the problem together, and not wait for me to tell you the answer; because, truth must be discovered each minute, not merely explained. Truth is not knowledge—knowledge is merely the cultivation of memory, and memory is a continuity of experiences; and that which is continuous can never be the truth. So, let us investigate these questions together. I am not saying this merely to be rhetorical: I actually mean it. You and I are going to find out the truth of the matter. If you discover it for yourself, it is yours; but if you wait for me to give the answer, it will have very little value, for then you will merely remain on the verbal level and hear only words, and the words will not carry you very far.

Question: What system would assure us of economic security?

KRISHNAMURTI: Now, what do we mean by a system? The world is torn at the present time between two systems, the left and the right. The world is broken up by beliefs, by ideas, by formulas, and we seek economic or physical security along certain lines. Now, can there be security according to any particular system? Can you base existence on any particular belief, conclusion, or theory? There is the system of the left, and the system of the right. Both of them promise economic security, and they are at war with each other—which means that you are not secure. You are not secure, you are quarrelling over s,

cultivating war in the process. So, as long as you depend on a system for security, there must be insecurity. Surely, that is fairly clear, is it not? Those who hold to beliefs, to Utopian promises, are not concerned with people: they are concerned with ideas; and action based on ideas must inevitably breed separatism and disintegration—which is actually what is taking place. So, as long as we look for security through a system, through an idea, obviously there must be separatism, contention, and disintegration, which invariably brings about insecurity.

The next problem is this: is economic security a matter of legislation, of compulsion, of totalitarianism? We all want to be secure. It is essential to be physically secure, to have food, clothing and shelter, otherwise we cannot exist. But is that security brought about by legislation, by economic regulation—or is it a psychological problem? So far, we have considered it merely as an economic problem, a matter of economic adjustment; but surely it is a psychological problem, is it not? And can such a problem be solved by economic experts? Since the economic problem is obviously the result of our own inclinations, desires, and pursuits, it is really a psychological problem; and in order to bring about economic security, we must understand the psychological demand to be secure. I do not know if I am making myself clear.

The world is now torn up into different nationalities, different beliefs, different political ideologies, each promising security, a future Utopia; and obviously, such a process of separatism is a process of disintegration.

Now, can there ever be unity through ideas? Can ideas, beliefs, ever bring people together? Obviously, they cannot—it is being proved throughout the world. So, to bring about security, not for a small group of people but for the whole

of mankind, there must be freedom from this process of division created by ideas—the idea of being a Christian, a Buddhist, a Hindu, a nationalist, a communist, a socialist, a capitalist, an American, a Russian, or God knows what else. It is these things that are separating us, and they are nothing but beliefs, ideas; and as long as we cling to beliefs as a means of security, there must be separation, there must be disintegration and chaos.

So, this is fundamentally a psychological, not an economic problem; it is a problem of the individual psyche, and therefore we have to understand the process of individuality, of the 'you'. Is the 'you' in America different from the 'me' that lives in India or in Europe? Though we may separate ourselves by customs, by formulas, by certain beliefs, fundamentally we are the same, are we not? Now, when the 'me' seeks security in a belief, that very belief gives strength to the 'me'. I am a Hindu, a socialist, I belong to a particular religion, a particular sect, and I cling to that and defend it. So, the very attachment to belief creates separatism, which is obviously a cause of contention between you and me. The economic problem can never be solved as long as we separate ourselves into nationalities, into religious groups, or belong to particular ideologies. So, it is essentially a psychological problem, that is, a problem of the individual in relationship to society; and society is the projection of oneself. That is why there can be no solution to any human problem without understanding oneself completely—which means living in a state of complete inward insecurity. We want to be outwardly secure, and so we pursue inward security; but as long as we are seeking inward security through beliefs, through attachments, through ideologies, obviously we will create islands of isolation in the form of national, ideological and religious

groups, and therefore be at war with each other.

So, it is important to understand the process of oneself. But self-knowledge is not a means of ultimate security—on the contrary, reality is something which has to be discovered from moment to moment. A mind that is secure can never be in a state of discovery; and a mind that is insecure has no belief, it is not caught in any particular ideology. Such a mind is not seeking inward security, therefore it will create outward security. As long as you are seeking security inwardly, you will never have security outwardly. Therefore, the problem is not to bring about outward security, but to understand the desire to be inwardly, psychologically secure; and as long as we do not understand that, we shall never have peace, we shall never have security in the outer world.

Now, one is horrified, very often, to discover in oneself appalling distortions. How is one to be free from them? There are different ways of attempting to be free, are there not? There is the psychoanalytical process, and there is the process of control, of discipline, and the process of escape. Can one be free fundamentally through the psychoanalytical process? I am not condemning psychoanalysis—but let us examine it. First of all, the 'me', the whole structure of the 'me', is the result of the past. You and I are the result of the past, of time, of many incidents, experiences; we are made up of various qualities, memories, idiosyncrasies. The whole structure of the 'me' is the past. Now, in the past there are certain qualities which I dislike and want to get rid of, so I go into the past and look at them; I bring them out and analyze them, hoping to dissolve them; or, using the actions of the present as a mirror to reflect the past, I try to dissolve the past. Either I go to the past and try to dissolve it through analysis, or I

use the present as a means through which the past is discovered, that is, in present action I seek to discover and understand the past. So, that is one way.

Then there is the way of discipline. I say to myself, 'These particular distortions are not worthwhile, I am going to suppress, subjugate, control them'. This implies, does it not?, that there is an entity separate from the thought process—call it the higher self, or what you will—that is controlling, dominating, choosing. Surely, that is implied, is it not? When I say, 'I am going to dissolve the distortions', I am separate from those distortions. That is, I don't like the distortions, they hinder me, they bring about fear, conflict, and I want to dissolve them; so there arises the idea that the 'me' is separate from the distortions and is capable of dissolving them.

Before we discuss this further, we will have to find out if the 'me', the examiner, the observer, the analyzer, is different from the qualities. Am I making it clear? Is the thinker, the experiencer, the observer, different from the thought, from the experience, from the thing which is observed? Is the 'me' whether you place it at the highest or at the lowest level—is that 'me' different from the qualities which compose it? Is the thinker, the analyzer, different from his thoughts? You think that he is—that the thinker is separate from thought; therefore, you control thought, you shape thought, you subjugate, push it aside. The thinker, you say, is different from thought. But is that so? Is there a thinker without thought? If you have no thought, where is the thinker? So, thought creates the thinker; the thinker doesn't create thought. The moment we separate the thinker from the thought, we have the whole problem of trying to control, dissipate, suppress thought, or of trying to be free from a particular thought. This is the conflict between the 'thinker'

and the thought in which most of us are caught—it is our whole problem.

One sees certain distortions in oneself which one doesn't like, and one wants to be free of them; so one tries to analyze or to discipline them, that is, to do something about the thoughts. But before we do that, should we not find out if the thinker is actually separate from thought? Obviously he is not: the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experienced—they are not two different processes, but a single, unitary process. Thought divides itself and creates the thinker for its own convenience. That is, thought is invariably transient, it has no resting place; and seeing itself as transient, thought creates the thinker as the permanent entity. The permanent entity then acts upon thought, choosing this particular thought and rejecting that. Now, when you really see the falseness of that process, you will discover that there is no thinker, but only thoughts—which is quite a revolution. This is the fundamental revolution which is essential in order to understand the whole process of thinking. As long as you establish a thinker independent of his thoughts, you are bound to have conflict between the thinker and the thought; and where there is conflict, there can be no understanding. Without understanding this division in yourself, do what you will—suppress, analyze, discover the cause of struggle, go to a psychoanalyst, and all the rest of it—you will inevitably remain in the process of conflict. But if you can see and understand the truth that the thinker is the thought, the analyzer is the analyzed—if you can understand that, not merely verbally, but in actual experience, then you will discover that an extraordinary revolution is taking place. Then there is no permanent entity as the 'me' choosing and discarding, seeking a result, or trying to achieve an end. Where there is choice there must be conflict; and choice will

never lead to understanding, because choice implies a thinker who chooses. So, to be free of a particular distortion, a particular perversion, we must first discover for ourselves the truth that the thinker is not separate from thought; then we will see that what we call distortion is a process of thinking, and that there is no thinker apart from that process.

Now, what do we mean by thinking? When we say, 'This is ugly', 'That is fear', 'This must be discarded', we know what that process is. There is the 'me' who is choosing, condemning, discarding. But if there is not the 'me' but only that process of fear, then what happens? Am I explaining the problem? If there is not the one who condemns, who chooses, who thinks that he is separate from that which he dislikes, then what happens? Please experience this as we go along, and you will see. Don't merely listen to my words, but actually experience that there is only thought, and not the thinker. Then you will see what thinking is. What is thought? Thought is a process of verbalization, is it not? Without words, you cannot think. So, thought is a process of memory, because words, symbols, names, are the product, the result of memory. So, thinking is a process of memory; and memory gives a name to a particular feeling and either condemns or accepts it. By giving a name to something, you condemn or accept it, don't you? When you say someone is an American, a Russian, a Hindu, a Negro, you have finished with him, haven't you? By labeling a thing you think you have understood it. So, when there is a particular reaction which you term 'fear', in giving it a name you have condemned it. That is the actual process you will see going on when you begin to be aware of your thinking.

Is it possible not to name a feeling? Because, by calling a particular feeling 'anger', 'fear', 'jealousy', we have given it strength,

have we not? We have fixed it. The very naming is a process of confirming that feeling, giving it strength, and therefore enclosing it in memory. Observe it and you will see. It is possible to be free fundamentally only when the process of naming is understood—naming being terming, symbolizing, which is the action of memory; because memory is the 'you'. Without your memory, without your experiences, the 'you' is not, and the mind clings to those experiences as essential in order to be secure. So, we cultivate memory, which is experience, knowledge; and through that process we hope to control the reactions and feelings which we call distortions. If we would be free of any particular quality, we must understand the whole process of the thinker and the thought, we must see the truth that the thinker is not separate from thought, but that they are a single, unitary process. If you actually realize that, you will see what an extraordinary revolution takes place in your life. By revolution I do not mean economic revolution—which is no revolution at all, but merely a modified continuity of what is. But when the thinker realizes that he is not different from thought, then you will see that radically, deeply, there is an extraordinary transformation; because, then there is only the fact of thought, and not the translation of that fact to suit the thinker.

Now, what is there to understand about a fact? There is nothing, is there? A fact is a fact, it is self-evident. The struggle to understand comes only when the thinker is trying to do something about the fact. The action of the thinker upon the fact is shaped by his memory, by his past experience; therefore, the fact is always shaped by the thinker, and therefore he never understands the fact. But if there is no thinker, but only the fact, then the fact has not to be understood—it is a fact; and when you are face to face with a

fact, what happens? When there is no escape, when there is no thinker trying to give the fact a meaning to suit himself or shape it according to his particular pattern, what happens? When you are face to face with a fact, surely then you have understood it, have you not? Therefore, there is freedom from it. And such freedom is a radical freedom, it is not just a superficial reaction, a result of the mind's trying to identify itself with a particular opposite. As long as we are seeking a result there must be the thinker, there must be the process of isolation; and a person who, in his thoughts, is isolated as the thinker, can never find what is true. The socalled religious person who is seeking God is merely establishing himself as a permanent entity apart from his thoughts, and such a person can never find reality.

So, then, our problem is this: being aware of a particular reaction, of a response of fear, of guilt, of anger, of envy, or what you will, how is one to be radically free of it? One can see that it is impossible to be free of it through discipline, because a product of conflict is never the truth; it is only a result, the effect of a cause. Whereas, if one sees as true, that the thinker can never be separate from his thought, that the qualities and memories of the 'me' are not separate from the 'me'—when one realizes that and has direct experience of it, then one will see that thought becomes a fact, and that there is no translating of the fact. The fact is the truth, and when you are confronted with truth and there is no other action but seeing it directly as it is, without condemnation or justification, that very recognition of the fact frees the mind from the fact.

So, only when the mind is capable of seeing itself in its relationship to all things is it possible for the mind to be quiet, to be tranquil. The mind that is tranquil through a process of isolation, of subjugation, of control, is not tranquil, but dead, it is merely

conforming to a pattern, seeking a particular result. Only a free mind can be tranquil, and that freedom does not come through any form of identification; on the contrary, it comes only when we realize that the thinker is the thought, and not separate from thought. The tranquillity of freedom, of understanding, is not a matter of knowledge. Knowledge can never bring understanding. Knowledge is merely the cultivation of memory, in which the mind seeks security, and such a mind can never understand reality. Reality can be found only in freedom, which means to face the fact as it is, without distorting it. There must be distortion as long as the 'I' is separate from the thing it observes. Surely, the tranquil mind is a free mind, and it is only in freedom that truth can be discovered.

June 4, 1959.

II

TALK IN NEW YORK

I think it is important to see the necessity of self-knowledge; because, what we are, that we project. If we are confused, uncertain, worried, ambitious, cruel or fearful, it is just that which we produce in the world. We do not seem to realize how essential it is for thought and action that there should be a fundamental understanding of oneself—not only of the superficial layers of one's consciousness, but also of the deeper layers of the unconscious, of the totality of one's whole process of thinking and feeling. We seem to regard this understanding of oneself as such a difficult task that we prefer to run away from it into all kinds of infantile, immature activities, such as ceremonies, so-called spiritual organizations, political groups, and so on—anything rather than

study and comprehend oneself integrally and completely.

The fundamental understanding of oneself does not come through knowledge or through the accumulation of experiences, which is merely the cultivation of memory. The understanding of oneself is from moment to moment; and if we merely accumulate knowledge of the self, that very knowledge prevents further understanding, because accumulated knowledge and experience become the centre through which thought focuses and has its being. The world is not different from us and our activities, because it is what we are which creates the problems of the world; and the difficulty with the majority of us is that we do not know ourselves directly, but seek a system, a method, a means of operation by which to solve the many human problems.

Now, is there a means, a system, of knowing oneself? Any clever person, any philosopher, can invent a system, a method; but surely, the following of a system will merely produce a result created by that system, will it not? If I follow a particular method of knowing myself, then I shall have the result which that system necessitates; but that result will obviously not be the understanding of myself. That is, by following a method, a system, a means through which to know myself, I shape my thinking, my activities, according to a pattern; but the following of a pattern is not the understanding of oneself.

So, there is no method for self-knowledge. Seeking a method invariably implies the desire to attain some result—and that is what we all want. We follow authority—if not that of a person, then of a system, of an ideology—because we want a result which will be satisfactory, which will give us security. We really do not want to understand ourselves, our impulses and reactions, the whole process of our think-

ing, the conscious as well as the unconscious ; we would rather pursue a system which assures us of a result. But the pursuit of a system is invariably the outcome of our desire for security, for certainty, and the result is obviously not the understanding of oneself. When we follow a method, we must have authorities — the teacher, the *guru*, the saviour, the Master—who will guarantee us what we desire ; and surely, that is not the way to self-knowledge.

Authority prevents the understanding of oneself, does it not ? Under the shelter of an authority, a guide, you may have temporarily a sense of security, a sense of well-being ; but that is not the understanding of the total process of oneself. Authority in its very nature prevents the full awareness of oneself, and therefore ultimately destroys freedom ; and in freedom alone can there be creativeness. There can be creativeness only through self-knowledge. Most of us are not creative, we are repetitive machines, mere gramophone records playing over and over again certain songs of experience, certain conclusions and memories, either our own or those of another. Such repetition is not creative being—but it is what we want. Because we want to be inwardly secure, we are constantly seeking methods and means for this security, and thereby we create authority, the worship of another, which destroys comprehension, that spontaneous tranquillity of mind in which alone there can be a state of creativeness.

Surely, our difficulty is that most of us have lost this sense of creativeness. To be creative does not mean that we must paint pictures or write poems and become famous. That is not creativeness—it is merely the capacity to express an idea which the public applauds or disregards. Capacity and creativeness should not be confused. Capacity is not creativeness. Creativeness is quite a different state of being, is it not ? It is a

state in which the self is absent, in which the mind is no longer a focus of our experiences, our ambitions, our pursuits, and our desires. Creativeness is not a continuous state, it is new from moment to moment, it is a movement in which there is not the 'me', the 'mine', in which the thought is not focused around any particular experience, ambition, achievement, purpose, and motive. It is only when the self is not, that there is creativeness—that state of being in which alone there can be reality, the creator of all things. But that state cannot be conceived or imagined, it cannot be formulated or copied, it cannot be attained through any system, through any method, through any philosophy, through any discipline ; on the contrary, it comes into being only through understanding the total process of oneself.

The understanding of oneself is not a result, a culmination ; it is seeing oneself from moment to moment in the mirror of relationship— one's relationship to property, to things, to people, and to ideas. But we find it difficult to be alert, to be aware, and we prefer to dull our minds by following a method, by accepting authorities, superstitions, and gratifying theories ; so, our minds become weary, exhausted, and insensitive. Such a mind cannot be in a state of creativeness. That state of creativeness comes only when the self, which is the process of recognition and accumulation, ceases to be ; because, after all, consciousness as the 'me' is the centre of recognition, and recognition is merely the process of the accumulation of experience. But we are all afraid to be nothing, because we all want to be something. The little man wants to be a big man, the unvirtuous wants to be virtuous, the weak and obscure crave power, position, and authority. This is the incessant activity of the mind. Such a mind cannot be quiet, and therefore can understand the state of ..

So, to transform the world about us, with its misery, wars, unemployment, starvation, class divisions, and utter confusion, there must be a transformation in ourselves. The revolution must begin within oneself—but not according to any belief or ideology; because revolution based on an idea, or in conformity to a particular pattern, is obviously no revolution at all. To bring about a fundamental revolution in oneself, one must understand the whole process of one's thought and feeling in relationship. That is the only solution to all our problems—and not to have more disciplines, more beliefs, more ideologies and more teachers. If we can understand ourselves as we are from moment to moment without the process of accumulation, then we will see how there comes a tranquillity that is not a product of the mind, a tranquillity that is neither imagined nor cultivated; and only in that state of tranquillity can there be creativeness.

There are several questions, and in considering them together, let us as individuals experiment together to find out the truth of each question. It is not my explanation that is going to dissolve the problem, nor your eager search for a solution; but what dissolves any problem is to unravel it step by step and thereby see the truth of it. It is seeing the truth of our difficulties, which dissolves them; but to see things as they are is not easy. Listening is an art; and if in listening we can follow what is said experimentally, operationally, then there is a possibility of seeing the truth and thereby dissolving the particular problem which may confront each one of us.

Question: What mental attitude would you consider best suited for the achievement of contentment in today's troubled world, and how would you suggest we attain it?

KRISHNAMURTI: When you want to attain contentment, you have an idea about it, haven't you? You have a preconception of what it is to be contented, and you want to be in that state; so, you seek a method, you want to know how to attain it. Is contentment a result, a thing to be achieved? Is not the very search for a result itself the cause of discontent? Surely, the moment I want to be something, I have already sown the seed of discontent; because I want to attain contentment, I have already brought discontent into being.

Please let us see the significance of this desire to achieve an end. The end is always gratifying, it is something that we think will give us permanent security, happiness. That is, the end is always self-projected; and having projected it, or imagined it, or formulated it in words, we want to attain it, and then we seek a method for its attainment. We want to know how to be contented. Does not that very desire to be contented, or the search for a method to that end, show the stupidity of our own minds? A man who says, 'I want to attain contentment', is surely already in a state of stagnation. He is only concerned with being enclosed in a state wherein nothing will disturb him; so, his contentment is really the ultimate security, which is undisturbed isolation. Contentment which is achieved, and which we call the highest spiritual attainment, is really a condition of decay. But if we can understand the process of discontent, see what it is that brings it about; if, without coming to any conclusion, we can be aware of the ways of discontent, choicelessly watching its every movement—then, in that very understanding, there comes a state of contentment which is not a product of the mind, the thought process, or of desire.

Whatever the mind produces is obviously based on thought, and thought is merely the response of memory, of sensation. When we

seek contentment, we are pursuing a sensation that will be completely satisfying; and sensation can never be contentment. If I am aware that I am contented, if I am conscious of it, is that contentment? Is virtue self-conscious? Is happiness a state in which I am conscious that I am happy? Surely, the moment I am aware that I am contented, I am discontented; I want more. (Laughter.) Please do not laugh at these things, because by laughing you are putting it away, you are not taking it in. It is a superficial reaction to something serious which you do not want to face and look at.

Contentment is a thing that cannot be achieved—though all the religious books, all the saints and the Masters, promise it to you. Their promise is no promise at all; it is just a vanity which gratifies you. But there is a possibility of understanding the whole process of discontent, is there not? What is it that makes me discontented? Surely, it is the desire for a result, a reward, an achievement, the desire to become something. In the very process of achieving a reward, there is punishment; and the man who seeks a reward is already punishing himself. Gaining implies discontent. The longing to achieve creates the fear of loss, and the very desire to attain contentment brings discontent. It is important, is it not?, to see this, not as a theory, not as something to be thought about, discussed, and meditated upon, but as a simple fact. The moment you want something, you have already created discontent; and all the advertisements, everything in our society, is instigating this desire to possess, to grow, to achieve, to become. And can this struggle to become something, be called evolution, growth, progress?

Surely, there is a process of understanding discontent; and in the process of understanding it, you will see that discontent is the very nature of the self, the 'me'. The 'me' is the

centre of discontent, because the 'me' is the accumulation of memories; and memories cannot thrive unless there are more memories, more sensations. Until you and I understand the 'me', which is the centre of discontent, until we go into it and understand this whole process of becoming, achieving, there must always be discontent. How can a mind that is agitated by the desire for a result, ever understand anything? It may be quiet for a time in the isolation of its own achievement; but such a mind is obviously self-enclosed, and it can never know the tranquillity of that contentment which is not a result. The mind that is caught up in a result can never be free, and it is only in freedom that there can be contentment.

Question: You say we use physiological needs for our psychological expansion and security. You further show us that security is nonexistent. This gives us a feeling of complete hopelessness and fear. Is this all?

KRISHNAMURTI: This is a complex problem, and let us work it out together. First of all, there must be a physiological security, must there not? You must have food, clothing, and shelter. There must be security in the sense that our physical needs must be satisfied, otherwise we cannot exist at all. But the physical needs are used as a means for our psychological self-expansion, are they not? That is, one uses property, clothes, all the physical necessities, as a means of one's own position, progress, and authority.

To put it in a different way, nationalism, calling oneself an American, a Russian, a Hindu, or what you will, is obviously one of the causes of war. Nationalism is separatism, and that which separates obviously disintegrates. Nationalism destroys physical security; but one is nationalistic because there is a psychological sec-

urity in being identified with the larger, with a particular country, group, or race. It gives me a sense of psychological security to call myself a Hindu, or by some other name. I feel flattered, it gives me a sense of well-being.

Similarly, we use property, things, as a means of psychological enlargement, expansion of the 'me'; and that is why we have all this confusion, conflict and separation which is taking place in the world. So, the economic problem is not wholly on its own level, but is fundamentally a psychological problem. That is one of the things involved in this question.

Now, as long as we are seeking psychological or inward security, obviously we must deny outward security. That is, as long as we are nationalistic, we must create war, thereby destroying the outward security which is so essential. It is the individual's seeking of inward security that brings about wars, class struggles, the innumerable divisions of religion, and all the rest of the business, ultimately destroying outward security for all. So, as long as I am seeking inward security in any form, I must bring about outward chaos and misery. The mere rearrangement of outward security, individual or collective, without understanding the inward processes of desire, is utterly futile; because, the psychological necessity for inward expansion will inevitably destroy whatever outward structure has been created. This is a fact which we can discuss and which I will go into later.

Now, inward security is a non-existent state, and when we seek it, what we are doing is merely isolating ourselves, enclosing ourselves in an idea, in a hope, in a particular pattern which gratifies us. That is, we enclose ourselves either in the collective experience and knowledge, or in our own particular experience

and knowledge, and in that state we like to remain because we feel secure. Having a particular name, possessing certain qualities and things, gives you a sense of wellbeing. Calling yourself a doctor, a mayor, a swami, or God knows what else, gives you a sense of inward security; and that inward security is obviously a process of separation, and therefore of disintegration.

Now, when you actually see that there is no inward security, you say you have a feeling of complete hopelessness and fear. Why is there this sense of hopelessness? Why is there this sense of despair? What do you mean by hope? A man who clings to hope is obviously dead; a man who is hoping is dying, because to him what is important is the future—not what is, but what will be. A man who lives in hope is not living at all; he is living somewhere else, in the future, and living in the future is obviously not living. Now, you say that when you are without hope, you become hopeless. Is that so? When you see the truth about hope, how destructive it is, do you become hopeless? Do you? If you see the truth that there is no inward security of any kind—really see the truth of it, not merely speculate about the psychological state of insecurity—are you hopeless, are you in despair? Because we always think in terms of opposites, when we are in despair we want hope; and when there is no hope, we become hopeless. Does this not indicate that we are seeking a state in which there will be no disturbance of any kind? And why should we not be disturbed? Must not the mind be completely uncertain, in order to find out? But the moment you are uncertain, you fall into a state of hopelessness, despair, and fear; and then you develop a philosophy of despair and pursue that. Surely, if you really see the truth as regards hope, there comes a freedom from both hopelessness and hope; but one must see it, one

must realize and experience that state.

What do we mean by fear? Fear of what? Fear of not being? Fear of what you are? Fear of losing, of being at a loss? Fear, whether conscious or unconscious, is not abstract: it exists only in relation to something. What we are afraid of is being insecure, is it not? We are afraid of being insecure—not only economically, but much more so inwardly. That is, we are afraid of loneliness, afraid of being nothing, afraid of a sense of complete denudation, a total purgation of all the beliefs, experiences and memories of the mind. Of that state, whatever it is, we are afraid; the state of not being loved, of losing, or not achieving. But when once we see what loneliness is, when we know what it is to be lonely without escape, then there is a possibility of going beyond, because, aloneness is entirely different from loneliness. There must be aloneness; but at present we are made up of many things, of many influences, and we are never alone. We are not individuals, we are merely a bundle of collective responses, with a particular name and a particular group of memories, both inherited and acquired. Surely, that is not individuality.

Now, to understand what it is to be alone, you must understand the whole process of fear. The understanding of fear ultimately brings you to that state in which you are completely empty, completely alone; that is, you are face to face with a loneliness which cannot be satisfied, which cannot be filled in, and from which there is no escape. Then you will see that one can go beyond loneliness—and then there is neither hope nor hopelessness, but a state of aloneness in which there is no fear.

As I said, a man who hopes is obviously not living, because to him the future is extraordinarily important; therefore, he is willing to sacrifice the present for the future. That is

what all the ideologists, all the people who build Utopias, are doing; they are sacrificing the present, that is, they are willing to liquidate you and me for the future—as though they knew the future. All political parties, all ideologists, dangle a hope in front of us; and those who pursue hope are ultimately destroyed. But if we can understand the desire for inward security, see its whole process, and not merely deny it or live in some fanciful state; if through alert watchfulness we are aware of every response of the self, of the 'me', and see that there is no inward security of any kind, whether through property, through a person, or through an ideology; then, in that state of complete insecurity of the mind, there comes a freedom in which alone there is a possibility of discovering what is. But such a state is not for those who hope, or fear, or who want to achieve a result.

Question: How can I experience God in myself?

KRISHNAMURTI: What do we mean by experience? What is the process of experiencing? When do we say, 'I have had an experience'? We say that only when we recognize the experience, that is, only when there is an experiencer apart from the experience. This means that our experiencing is a process of recognition and accumulation. Am I explaining myself?

I can experience only when there is a recognition of the experience, and the recognition is recollection, memory; and memory is obviously the centre of the 'me'. That is, the whole process of recognition and accumulation of experience is the 'me'; and the 'me' then says, 'I have had an experience'. What is recognized and accumulated as experience is the response to stimuli, the response to challenge. If I do not recognize the res-

ponse to a challenge, I have no experience. Surely, if you challenge me, and I do not recognize the meaning, the significance of your challenge, nor my response to it, how can I have an experience? There is experiencing only when I respond to a challenge and recognize the response.

Now, the questioner asks, "How can I experience God in myself?" Is God, reality, or what you will, a thing to be experienced, a thing to be recognized, so that you can say, 'I have had an experience of God'? Obviously, God is the unknown; it cannot be the known. The moment you know it, it is not God: it is something self-projected, recognized, which is memory. That is why the believer can never know God; and since most of you believe in God, you can never know God, because your very belief prevents you. But non-belief in God, which is another form of belief, also hinders the discovery of the unknown; because all belief is obviously a process of the mind. Belief is the result of the known. You may believe in the unknown, but that belief is born of the known, it is part of the known, which is memory. Memory says, 'I do not know God, it is something unknown'. So, memory creates the unknown, and then believes in it as a means of experiencing the unknown.

Is God to be believed in? The priests, the preachers, the organizers of religions, the bishops, the cardinals, the butcher, the man who flies an airplane and drops a bomb—they all say, 'God is with me'. The man who makes money, exploits others, the man who accumulates wealth and builds temples or churches, says that God is his companion. All such people believe in God; and surely, their belief is merely a form of self-expansion, it is their own conceit. Such people, those who believe in organized dogmas, who have conditioned their minds according to a particular pattern called religion,

obviously can never know the ultimate reality.

For the unknown to be, the mind must be completely empty; there can be no experiencing of reality, because the experieocer is the 'me', with all his accumulated memories, conscious as well as unconscious. The 'me', which is the residue of all that, says, 'I am experiencing'; but what he can experience is only his own projection. The 'me' cannot experience the unknown, he can only experience the known, the self-projected, the thing believed in or hoped for, which is the creation of thought as a reaction from the past. Such a mind is obviously incapable of being completely empty, completely alone, and therefore it can never be free. It is only a free mind that can know what is—that thiog which is indescribable, which cannot be put into words for you or me to recognize. The description of it is merely the cultivation of memory, to verbalize it, is to put it in time, and that which is of time can never be the timeless.

So, the important thing is not what you believe or disbelieve, or what your activities are, but to understand the whole process, the whole content, of yourself, and that means being aware from moment to momeot without any sense of accumulation. When the mind is utterly tranquil, quiet, without any sense of acceptance or rejection, without any sense of acquisitiveness or accumulation, when there is that state of tranquillity in which the experiencer is not—only then is there that which may be called God. The word is not important. And then there is a state of creation which is not the expression of the self.

June 11, 1950.

III

TALK IN NEW YORK

It is most important, is it not ?, that the various disintegrating factors in our lives should be understood. These disruptive elements exist, not only at the superficial or economic level, but also at the deeper levels of one's consciousness. We can see throughout the world that there is division, not only between various groups of people, but within the individual himself there is conflict, contradiction. Until we understand this contradiction in ourselves, we shall not be able to deal with the contradictions about us. This contradiction which exists in each one, and of which most of us are aware if we are at all thoughtful, cannot be resolved by the desire to be integrated—which merely becomes another problem to contend with; but if we can be aware of and understand the factors that bring about contradiction, then perhaps there will be a possibility of being integrated.

Now, what brings about contradiction in each one of us ? Surely, it is the desire to become something, is it not ? We all want to become something : to become successful in the world, and, inwardly, to achieve a result. So, as long as we think in terms of time, in terms of achievement, in terms of position, there must be contradiction. After all, the mind is the product of time. Thought is based on yesterday, on the past ; and as long as thought is functioning within the field of time, thinking in terms of the future, of becoming, gaining, achieving, there must be contradiction, because then we are incapable of facing exactly what is. Only in realizing, in understanding, in being choicelessly aware of what is, is there a possibility of freedom from that disintegrating factor which is contradiction.

So, it is essential, is it not ?, to understand the whole process of our

thinking, for it is there that we find contradiction. Thought itself has become a contradiction, because we have not understood the total process of ourselves ; and that understanding is possible only when we are fully aware of our thought, not as an observer operating upon his thought, but integrally and without choice—which is extremely arduous. Then only is there the dissolution of that contradiction which is so detrimental, so painful.

As long as we are trying to achieve a psychological result, as long as we want inward security, there must be a contradiction in our life. I do not think that most of us are aware of this contradiction ; or, if we are, we do not see its real significance. On the contrary, contradiction gives us an impetus to live ; the very element of friction makes us feel that we are alive. The effort, the struggle of contradiction, gives us a sense of vitality. That is why we love wars, that is why we enjoy the battle of frustrations. As long as there is the desire to achieve a result, which is the desire to be psychologically secure, there must be a contradiction ; and where there is contradiction, there cannot be a quiet mind. Quietness of mind is essential to understand the whole significance of life. Thought can never be tranquil ; thought, which is the product of time, can never find that which is timeless, can never know that which is beyond time. The very nature of our thinking is a contradiction, because we are always thinking in terms of the past or of the future, and therefore we are never fully cognizant, fully aware of the present.

To be fully aware of the present is an extraordinarily difficult task, because the mind is incapable of facing a fact directly without deception. As I explained, thought is the product of the past, and therefore it can only think in terms of the past or of the future, it cannot be completely aware of a fact in the present. So, as long

as thought, which is the product of the past, tries to eliminate contradiction and all the problems that it creates, it is merely pursuing a result, trying to achieve an end, and such thinking only creates more contradiction, and hence conflict, misery, and confusion in us, and, therefore, about us.

To be free of contradiction, one must be aware of the present without choice. How can there be choice when you are confronted with a fact? Surely, the understanding of the fact is made impossible as long as thought is trying to operate upon the fact in terms of becoming, changing, altering. So, self-knowledge is the beginning of understanding; and without self,~~does not require any expert, any~~ conflict will continue. To know the whole process, the totality of oneself, does not require any expert, any authority. The pursuit of authority only breeds fear. No expert, no specialist, can show us how to understand the process of the self. One has to study it for oneself. You and I can help each other by talking about it but none can unfold it for us, no specialist, no teacher, can explore it for us. We can be aware of it only in our relationship—in our relationship to things, to property, to people, and to ideas. In relationship we will discover that contradiction arises when action is approximating itself to an idea. The idea is merely the crystallization of thought as a symbol; and the effort to live up to the symbol brings about a contradiction.

So, as long as there is a pattern of thought, contradiction will continue; and to put an end to the pattern, and so to contradiction, there must be self-knowledge. This understanding of the self is not a process reserved for the few. The self is to be understood in our everyday speech, in the way we think and feel, in the way we look at another. If we can be aware of every thought, of every feeling, from moment to moment, then we shall see that in relationship the

ways of the self are understood. Then only is there a possibility of that tranquillity of mind in which alone the ultimate reality can come into being.

I am going to answer some questions, and when I do so, let us together explore each problem. I am not the authority, the specialist, the teacher, who is telling you what to do; that would be too absurd for grown up people—if we are grown up at all. So, in considering these questions, let us try to explore and discover the truth for ourselves. It is the discovery of truth that is going to free us from our problems; but that truth cannot be discovered, it cannot come to us, if the mind is merely agitated in the current of these problems. In order to discover the ways of the problem, the problem must be unfolded, and the mind allowed to be quiet; then we see the truth, and it is the truth that frees us.

Question : How am I to get rid of fear, which influences all my activities?

KRISHNAMURTI: This is a very complex problem requiring close attention; and if we do not follow and explore it fully in the sense of experiencing each step as we go along, we will not be able at the end of it to be free of fear.

What do we mean by fear? Fear of what? There are various types of fear, and we need not analyze every type. But we can see that fear comes into being when our comprehension of relationship is not complete. Relationship is not only between people, but between ourselves and nature, between ourselves and property, between ourselves and ideas; and as long as that relationship is not fully understood, there must be fear. Life is relationship. To be, is to be related, and without relationship there is no life. Nothing can exist in isolation, and

as long as the mind is seeking isolation, there must be fear. So, fear is not an abstraction; it exists only in relation to something.

Now, the question is, how to be rid of fear? First of all, anything that is overcome has to be conquered again and again. No problem can be finally overcome, conquered; it can be understood, but not conquered. They are two completely different processes; and the conquering process leads to further confusion, further fear. To resist, to dominate, to do battle with a problem, or to build a defence against it, is only to create further conflict. Whereas, if we can understand fear, go into it fully step by step, explore the whole content of it, then fear will never return in any form; and that is what I hope we can do this morning.

As I said, fear is not an abstraction; it exists only in relationship. Now, what do we mean by fear? Ultimately, we are afraid, are we not?, of not being, of not becoming. Now, when there is fear of not being, of not advancing, or fear of the unknown, of death, can that fear be overcome by determination, by a conclusion, by any choice? Obviously not. Mere suppression, sublimation, or substitution, creates further resistance, does it not? So, fear can never be overcome through any form of discipline, through any form of resistance. That fact must be clearly seen, felt and experienced: that fear cannot be overcome through any form of defence or resistance. Nor can there be freedom from fear through the search for an answer, or through mere intellectual or verbal explanation.

Now, what are we afraid of? Are we afraid of a fact, or of an idea about the fact? Please see this point. Are we afraid of the thing as it is, or are we afraid of what we think it is? Take death, for example. Are we afraid of the fact of death, or of the idea of death? The fact is one thing, and the idea about the fact is

another. Am I afraid of the word 'death', or of the fact itself? Because I am afraid of the word, of the idea, I never understand the fact, I never look at the fact, I am never in direct relation with the fact. It is only when I am in complete communion with the fact that there is no fear. But if I am not in communion with the fact, then there is fear; and there is no communion with the fact as long as I have an idea, an opinion, a theory, about the fact. So, I have to be very clear whether I am afraid of the word, the idea, or of the 'fact'. If I am face to face with the fact, there is nothing to understand about it; the fact is there, and I can deal with it. But if I am afraid of the word, then I must understand the word, go into the whole process of what the word, the term, implies.

For example, one is afraid of loneliness, afraid of the ache, the pain of loneliness. Surely, that fear exists because one has never really looked at loneliness, one has never been in complete communion with it. The moment one is completely open to the fact of loneliness, one can understand what it is; but one has an idea, an opinion about it, based on previous knowledge; and it is this idea, opinion, this previous knowledge about the fact, that creates fear. So, fear is obviously the outcome of naming, of terming, of projecting a symbol to represent the fact; that is, fear is not independent of the word, of the term. I hope I am making myself clear.

I have a reaction, say, to loneliness; that is, I say I am afraid of being nothing. Am I afraid of the fact itself, or is that fear awakened because I have previous knowledge of the fact, knowledge being the word, the symbol, the image? How can there be fear of a fact? When I am face to face with a fact, in direct communion with it, I can look at it, observe it; therefore, there is no fear of the fact. What causes fear is my apprehension about the fact, what the fact might be or do.

So, it is my opinion, my idea, my experience, my knowledge about the fact, that creates fear. As long as there is verbalization of the fact, giving the fact a name and therefore identifying or condemning it, as long as thought is judging the fact as an observer, there must be fear. Thought is the product of the past, it can only exist through verbalization, through symbols, through images; and as long as thought is regarding or translating the fact, there must be fear.

So, it is the mind that creates fear, the mind being the process of thinking. Thinking is verbalization. You cannot think without words, without symbols, images; these images, which are the prejudices, the previous knowledge, the apprehensions of the mind, are projected upon the fact, and out of that there arises fear. There is freedom from fear only when the mind is capable of looking at the fact without translating it, without giving it a name, a label. This is quite difficult, because the feelings, the reactions, the anxieties that we have, are promptly identified by the mind and given a word. The feeling of jealousy is identified by that word. Now, is it possible not to identify a feeling, to look at that feeling without naming it? It is the naming of the feeling that gives it continuity, that gives it strength. The moment you give a name to that which you call fear, you strengthen it; but if you can look at that feeling without terming it, you will see that it withers away. Therefore, if one would be completely free of fear, it is essential to understand this whole process of terming, of projecting symbols, images, giving names to facts. That is, there can be freedom from fear only when there is self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, which is the ending of fear.

Question: How can I permanently get rid of sexual desire?

KRISHNAMURTI: Why do we want to get permanently rid of a desire? You call it sexual, somebody else calls it attachment, fear, and so on. Why do we want to get rid of any desire permanently? Because that particular desire is disturbing to us, and we don't want to be disturbed. That is our whole process of thinking, is it not? We want to be self-enclosed, without any disturbance, that is, we want to be isolated; but nothing can live in isolation. In his search for God, the so-called religious person is really seeking complete isolation in which he will never be disturbed; but such a person is not really religious, is he? The truly religious are those who understand relationship completely, fully, and therefore have no problems, no conflict. Not that they are not disturbed; but because they are not seeking certainty, they understand disturbance and therefore there is no self-enclosing process created by the desire for security.

Now, this question requires a great deal of understanding, because we are dealing with sensation, which is thought. To most people, sex has become an extraordinarily important problem. Being uncreative, afraid, enclosed, cut off in all other directions, sex is the only thing through which most people can find a release, the one act in which the self is momentarily absent. In that brief state of abnegation when the self, the 'me', with all its troubles, confusions, and worries, is absent, there is great happiness. Through self-forgetfulness there is a sense of quietness, a release; and because we are uncreative religiously, economically, and in every other direction, sex becomes an overwhelmingly important problem. In daily life we are mere gramophone records, repeating phrases that we have learned; religiously we are automatons, mechanically following the priest; economically and socially we are bound, strangled, by environmental influences. Is there a release for us

in any of that? Obviously not; and where there is no release, there must be frustration. That is why the sexual act, in which there is a release, has become such a vital problem for most of us. And society encourages and stimulates it through advertisements, magazines, the cinema, and all the rest of it.

Now, as long as the mind, which is the result, the focal point of sensation, regards sex as a means of its release, sex must be a problem; and that problem will continue as long as we are incapable of being creative comprehensively, totally, and not merely in one particular direction. Creativeness has nothing to do with sensation. Sex is of the mind, and creation is not of the mind. Creation is never a product of the mind, a product of thought; and in that sense, sex, which is sensation, can never be creative. It may produce babies, but that is obviously not creativeness. As long as we depend for release on sensation, on stimulation in any form, there must be frustration, because the mind becomes incapable of realizing what creativeness is.

This problem cannot be resolved by any discipline, by any taboos, by any social edicts or sanctions. It can be resolved only when we understand the whole process of the mind; because it is the mind that is sexual. It is the mind's images, fancies, and pictures, that stimulate it to be sexual; and as the mind is the result of sensation, it can only become more and more sensuous. Such a mind can never be creative, because creation is not sensation. It is only when the mind does not seek stimuli in any form, whether outward or inward, that it can be completely quiet, free; and only in that freedom is there creation. We have made sex into something ugly because it is the only private sensation that we have; all other sensations are public, open. But as long as we use sensation in any form as a means of release, it will only

increase the problems, the confusion and trouble; because, release can never come into being through seeking a result.

The questioner wants to end sexual desire permanently because he has an idea that then he will be in a state in which all disturbances have disappeared; that is why he is seeking it, striving towards it. The very striving towards that state is preventing him from being free to understand the process of the mind. As long as the mind is merely seeking a permanent state in which it will have no disturbance of any kind, it is closed, and therefore it can never be creative. It is only when the mind is free of the desire to become something, to achieve a result, and hence free of fear, that it can be utterly quiet; and only then is there a possibility of that creativeness which is reality.

Question: Should I be a pacifist?

KRISHNAMURTI: I am afraid I cannot tell you what you should or should not be. We are supposed to be mature, and seeking advice from another in a matter of this kind indicates immaturity. The search for authority only creates corruption. It does not bring freedom. It is only in freedom that truth can be discovered. By following another you will never find what it is to be free of violence.

Let us find out what we mean by pacifism. Is pacifism opposed to violence? Is peace the denial of conflict? Is good the opposite of evil? When you deny vice and go to the opposite, is that virtue? If you deny, resist, put away the ugly, are you beautiful? Is the pursuit of an opposite ever peaceful, ever virtuous or beautiful? The opposite implies conflict, does it not? If you deny violence and pursue peace, what happens? The very pursuit of peace creates conflict, because you are denying violence. The very denial creates conflict; and is virtue ever the result of

conflict? Is peace the denial of war? War is obviously the extension, the projection of ourselves, is it not? War is the spectacular and bloody projection of our own daily existence. We call ourselves Americans, or Russians, or Hindus, or God knows what else, out of our desire to be safe; and this identification with a particular country, race, or group of people, gives us a sense of security. But identification with a group or nation means separation, leading to disintegration and war. Surely, as long as I am seeking identification in any form—with my family, with my group, with my property, with my particular ideology or belief—there must be separation, disintegration, and war. Although it is the dream of all ideologists, whether of the left or of the right, to have everybody believing in one particular theory or system, such a thing is an impossibility. Belief always separates, and therefore it is a disintegrating factor.

So, as long as you and I are in conflict inwardly, psychologically, there must be the projection of that conflict in the world as war. Without understanding your own inward conflict, merely to become a pacifist, or join an organization for peace, has no meaning. A man who merely resists war while remaining in psychological conflict only creates further confusion. But if you really understand this total process of inward conflict, which projects itself in the world as war, then obviously you are neither a war monger nor a mere pacifist—you are something entirely different; because you are at peace with yourself, you are at peace with the world. Being at peace inwardly and therefore outwardly, you will obviously not belong to any nationality, to any religion, to any particular group or class; and if you are brought before the tribunal to be conscripted, or whatever it is called, you will probably be shot. But that is not your responsibility: it is the responsibility of society, because society rejects

you. After all, society is not very intelligent anyhow. What is society? It is your own projection, is it not? What you and I are, society is. So, don't call society stupid and laugh at it. Society is the structure of ourselves in projection; and if we want to bring about a fundamental revolution in society, there must be a fundamental revolution in ourselves—which is an enormously difficult task. Any revolution based on an idea is never a revolution: it is merely a modified continuity. Ideas can never be revolutionary, because ideas are merely the reactions of memory. Thought is mere reaction; and an action based on reaction can never be fundamental, can never be true.

Surely, then, whether or not you should be a pacifist, is not the problem. We see that everything in the world is contributing to war. War is obviously no means of settling anything, but apparently we are incapable of learning that. We change enemies from time to time, and we seem to be quite satisfied with this process, which is kept going by propaganda, by our own desire to be revengeful, by our own inward, psychological conflict. So, we are encouraging war through nationalism, through greed, through the desire to be successful, to become somebody. That is, we encourage war inwardly, and then outwardly want to be pacifists, and such pacifism obviously has no meaning. It is only a contradiction. We all want to become something: a pacifist, a war hero, a millionaire, a virtuous man, or what you will. The very desire to become, involves conflict; and that conflict produces war. There is peace only when there is no desire to become something; and that is the only true state, because in that state alone there is creation, there is reality. But that is completely foreign to the whole structure of society—which is the projection of yourself. You worship success. Your god is success,

the giver of titles, degrees, position and authority. There is a constant battle within yourself, the struggle to achieve what you want. You never have a peaceful moment, there is never peace in your heart, because you are always striving to become something, to progress. Do not be misled by the word 'progress'. Mechanical things progress, but thought can never progress except in terms of its own becoming. Thought moves from the known to the known; but that is not growth, that is not evolution, that is not freedom.

So, if you want to be a pacifist in the true sense of the word, which is to be free of conflict, you have to understand yourself; and when the mind and heart are peaceful, quiet, then you will know what it is to be without conflict, which will express itself in action, whatever that action may be. But to make up your mind to become something, is merely a process of striving, which inevitably creates further conflict and strife. As every war produces another war, so each conflict produces more conflict. There can be real peace only when conflict ends, and to end conflict is to understand the whole process of oneself.

Question : I am not loved and I want to be, for without it life has no meaning. How can I fulfil this longing?

KRISHNAMURTI: I hope you are not merely listening to words, because then these meetings will be another distraction, a waste of time. But if you are really experiencing the things that we are discussing, then they will have an extraordinary significance; because, though you may follow words with the conscious mind, if you are experiencing what is being said, the unconscious also takes part in it. If given an opportunity, the unconscious will reveal its whole

content, and so bring about a complete understanding of ourselves. So, I hope you are not merely listening to another talk, but are actually experiencing the things as we go along.

The questioner wants to know how to love and to be loved. Is not that the state of most of us? We all want to be loved, and also to give love. We talk a great deal about it. All religions, all preachers, talk about it. So, let us find out what we mean by love. Is love sensation? Is love a thing of the mind? Can you think about love? You can think about the object of love, but you cannot think about love, can you? I can think about the person I love; I can have a picture, an image of that person, and recall the sensations, the memories, of our relationship. But is love sensation, memory? When I say, 'I want to love and be loved', is that not merely thought, a reflection of the mind? Is thought love? We think it is, do we not? To us, love is sensation. That is why we have pictures of the people whom we love, that is why we think about them and are attached to them. That is all a process of thought, is it not?

Now, thought is frustrated in different directions, and therefore it says, 'I find happiness in love, so I must have love'. That is why we cling to the person we love, that is why we possess the person, psychologically as well as physiologically. We create laws to protect the possession of what we love, whether it be a person, a piano, a piece of property, or an idea, a belief; because, in possession, with all its complications of jealousy, fear, suspicion, anxiety, we feel secure. So, we have made love into a thing of the mind; and with the things of the mind we fill the heart. Because the heart is empty, the mind says, 'I must have that love'; and we try to fulfil ourselves through the wife, through the husband. Through we try to become something.

is, love becomes a useful thing, we use love as a means to an end.

So, we have made of love a thing of the mind. The mind becomes the instrument of love, and the mind is only sensation. Thought is the reaction of memory to sensation. Without the symbol, the word, the image, there is no memory, there is no thought. We know the sensation of so-called love, and we cling to that; and when it fails, we want some other expression of that same sensation. So, the more we cultivate sensation, the more we cultivate so-called knowledge, which is merely memory, the less there is of love.

As long as we are *seeking* love, there must be a self-enclosing process. Love implies vulnerability, love implies communion; and there can be no communion, no vulnerability, as long as there is the self-enclosing process of thought. The very process of thought is fear; and how can there be communion with another when there is fear, when we use thought as a means for further stimulation?

There can be love only when you understand the whole process of the mind. Love is not of the mind, and you cannot think about love. When you say, 'I want love', you are thinking about it, you are longing for it, which is a sensation, a means to an end. Therefore, it is not love that you want, but stimulation; you want a means through which you can fulfil yourself, whether it be a person, a job, a particular excitement, and so on. Surely, that is not love. Love can be only when the thought of the self is absent, and freedom from the self lies through self-knowledge. With self-knowledge there comes understanding; and when the total process of the mind is completely and fully revealed and understood, then you will know what it is to love. Then you will see that love has nothing to do with sensation, that it is not a means of fulfilment. Then love is by itself, without result. Love is a state of being,

and in that state, the 'me', with its identifications, anxieties, and possessions, is absent. Love cannot be, as long as the activities of the self, of the 'me', whether conscious or unconscious, continue to exist. That is why it is important to understand the process of the self, the centre of recognition which is the 'me'.

June 18, 1950

IV.

TALK IN NEW YORK

If we could find a way out of our conflict, we would not take recourse to authority; but as we do not find a means of resolving our innumerable and multiplying conflicts, we turn either to inward or outward authority for guidance and comfort. So, authority becomes very important in our lives. Because we are unable to understand and resolve conflict, we use authority as a means of avoiding conflict; and the means then becomes all-important, and not the fathoming, the exploring of the process of conflict.-

So, we have authority of innumerable kinds, inward as well as outward. Outward authority takes the form of knowledge, examples, teachers, and so on; and inwardly it is our own experiences and memories, to which we turn for guidance in moments of conflict and anxiety. So, authority, both outward and inward, offers us a hope of being free of our various troubles.

But can authority of any kind, inward or outward, resolve our problems? The more we seek authorities, ideals, conclusions, hopes, the more we depend on them; and dependence on authority becomes much more significant than the understanding of the conflict itself. The more we depend on authority, the more dependent we become, because dependence ultimately destroys confi-

dence in our own understanding of problems. Most of us have no confidence in our own capacity to find out, to explore the many problems; and when we depend on authority, obviously that confidence is denied.

Confidence is not arrogance. The more one has experienced, the more one is inwardly certain, the more arrogant and obstinate one becomes. Such self-confidence is only self-enclosure, a process of resistance. But there is, I think, a different kind of confidence which is not cumulative. To explore into the nature of conflict, one cannot bring to it that which one has accumulated; and if one explores with previous knowledge, it ceases to be exploration. Then you are merely moving from the known to the known, from certainty to certainty, from what you have experienced to what you hope to experience; and that is not exploration or experimentation. That is merely the cumulative process of knowledge, of experience, and the confidence it brings is assertive arrogance.

Now, I think there is a confidence which is much more subtle, much more worth while, and which comes when there is no sense of accumulation of any kind, but a constant exploration and discovery. It is this state of constant discovery, the capacity for constant exploration, that brings about an enduring confidence which is not arrogance. And that confidence, which is so essential, is denied when there is authority of any kind, when we depend on or look up to another for guidance in conduct. When we are dependent, it does give a certain self-assurance, even though it entails fear; but that assurance of following someone, belonging to a group, believing in an idea or in certain dogmas, is surely a self-enclosing process, is it not? The mind that is constantly isolating itself is bound to awaken fear, and so there is a wandering from one authority to

another, from one emotional exhaustion to another, and in this process our problems are never resolved, they only multiply.

Now, is it possible to look at our conflicts without bringing in any authority, external or inward? Surely, one can be passively aware of conflict without choice or condemnation; that is, one can be aware, not as an observer observing his experience or analyzing the thing in himself which he wishes to destroy, but aware with that passivity in which the observer is the observed. In that state of mind we will see that the problems are understood and resolved; whereas, if we choose the way of action with regard to a problem, or compare or condemn it, we only increase resistance, and therefore multiply the problems. This process of choice is going on at all levels of our being, and that is why, instead of decreasing problems, we are multiplying them. The multiplication of problems comes into being only when we seek an answer, a conclusion, and so depend on an authority, outward or inward. Dependence on authority actually prevents our understanding of any problem, which is always new. No problem is old; as long as it remains a problem, it is a challenge, and therefore it is always new. Problems are invariably self-projected, and therefore it is important to understand the whole process of oneself without authority, without following a pattern or looking up to an example, an ideal, or a leader.

Self-knowledge is the beginning of the end of all conflict, and it is only when conflict ceases that there can be creation. Creation cannot be verbalized, it is a state which comes into being when the process of thought is at an end; and only then will the unknowable come to you.

In considering these questions, let us take the journey of exploration together; let each one of us find the

truth of every problem for himself. It is no use waiting for the particular answer which you or I might like, or adhering to any particular opinion. To find out what is true, there must obviously be that passive alertness of mind which gives the capacity to explore each problem deeply.

Question: I have many friends, but I am in constant fear of being rejected by them. What should I do ?

KRISHNAMURTI: What is the problem? Is the problem one of rejection and fear, or is it a question of dependence? Why do we want to have friends? Not that we should not have friends; but when we feel the necessity of having friends, when there is this dependence on others, what does it indicate? Does it not indicate insufficiency in oneself? Does not loneliness indicate an inward poverty? And being lonely, inwardly poor, insufficient, we turn to friends, to love, to activity, to ideas, to possessions, to knowledge and technique. That is, being inwardly poor, we depend on outward things; so, the outward things become very important to us. When we use something as a means of escape from ourselves, obviously it becomes very important. We cling to things, to ideas, and to people, because psychologically we depend on them; and when they are taken away, as when our friends reject us, we are lost, we are afraid. So, dependence indicates inward uncertainty, inward poverty; and as long as we use or depend on others, there must be fear of loss.

Now, can this loneliness, this inward poverty or emptiness, be filled through any action of the mind? If I may suggest, please listen and follow it out by watching your own mind, and you will find the answer for yourself. I am only describing the experience as we go along; but

to experience it for yourself, you must be passively alert, and not merely follow words.

So, being inwardly poor, we try to escape from this poverty through work, through knowledge, through love, through many forms of activity. We listen to the radio, read the latest book, pursue an idea or a virtue, accept a belief — anything to escape from ourselves. Our thinking is a process of escape from what is; and can that inward emptiness ever be covered up or filled? One can know the truth of that only when one does not escape — which is extremely arduous. One must be aware that one is escaping, and see that all escapes are similar, that there is no 'noble' escape. All escapes, from drunkenness to God, are the same, because one is escaping from what is, which is oneself, one's own inward poverty. It is only when one really ceases to escape that one is face to face with the problem of loneliness, of inward insufficiency, which no knowledge, no experience, can cover up; and only then is there a possibility of understanding and so dissolving it. This loneliness, this inward insufficiency, is not merely the problem of people who have leisure, who have nothing else to do in life except study themselves; it is the problem of every one in the world, the rich and the poor, the man who is brilliant and the man who is dull.

So, can inward emptiness ever be covered up? If you have tried and failed to cover it up by means of one escape, surely you know that all escapes are futile, do you not? You don't have to go from one escape to another to see that psychological insufficiency can never be filled, covered up, or enriched. By thoroughly understanding one escape, the whole process of escape is understood, is it not? Then what happens? One is left with emptiness, with loneliness; and then the problem arises, is that loneliness different from the

entity that feels lonely? Obviously not. It is not that the entity feels empty, but that he himself is emptiness; and the separation between the entity that feels empty, and the state which he calls emptiness, arises only in giving that state a name, a term, a label. When you do not name that state, then you will see there is no separation between the observer and the observed; the observer is the observed, which is insufficiency. In other words, when there is no naming or terming, an integration takes place between the experiencer and the experienced; and then you can proceed further to find out if that state which you have been avoiding as lonely, insufficient, is really so, or is merely a reaction to the word 'lonely', which awakens fear.

Is it the word or the fact that awakens fear? Is any fact ever fearful, or is it an idea about the fact that makes for fear? If you have followed this whole process, you will see that when there is no desire to escape from what is, there is no fear; and then there is a transformation of what is, because then the mind is no longer afraid to be what it is. In that state there is no sense of being lonely, insufficient: it is what it is. If you proceed deeper, you will see that the mind no longer rejects or accepts that state, and is therefore quiet; and only then is it possible to be free from that which is qualified as being lonely or insufficient. But to come to that, you must understand this whole process of inward insufficiency, escape and dependence; you must see how escape and the means of escape become much more important than the thing from which you are escaping; you must discover this division between the thinker and the condition which he calls lonely, and find out for yourself whether it is merely verbal, or an actual state. If it is verbal, then that separation goes on; but if you do not give it a name, then there is only that state which you no longer term lonely;

and only then is it possible for the mind to go beyond and discover further.

Question: What is the place of the individual in society?

KRISHNAMURTI: Is the individual different from society? Are you different from your environment? The environment has conditioned us to be Christians, capitalists, communists, socialists, or what you will; and the environment is in turn the projection of ourselves, is it not? Society is the projection of the individual, who is then further conditioned by that society. So, the individual and society are interrelated; they are not two separate states, or two separate entities. As long as you are conditioned by environment, is there a separate individuality? I am not saying that life is one—that is merely a theory. But it is important to discover whether the individual is separate from the environment, is it not? Though we may call ourselves individuals, are we not conditioned by society? Obviously we are. We are an integral part of society; therefore, although we appear to be separate entities, we are not really individuals. Physically, you and I are separate, dissimilar; but there is an extraordinary inward similarity. Whatever may be the superficial differences of race and custom, we are all more or less shaped along the same lines, we are all conditioned by fear, by dependence, by belief, by the desire to be secure, and so on. Surely, as long as we are conditioned by environment, which is our own projection, we are not really individuals, though we may bear different names. There is individuality only when we can go beyond this conditioning. Individuality is a state of creativeness, a state of aloneness, in which there is freedom from the conditioning influences of desire.

So, as long as we are bound by desire, as long as thought is merely the reaction of desire, which it is, there must be the conditioning influence of society, of the environment, and of our own experiences in reaction to society. We are an integral part of society; and if we try to establish a relationship between ourselves and society, as though we and society were two separate entities, then surely we shall misunderstand the whole process; then we shall merely resist or fight society. Until we understand how society influences, shapes, controls us, through our own instinctual responses of desire, we are obviously not unique individuals, though we may say, 'I am a separate soul', and all the rest of it. That is merely the assertion of a dogma, a belief—which will inevitably be denied by those who belong to another kind of society; so, we shall be conditioned in one way, and they will be conditioned in another. As long as we consider ourselves as entities separate from society, we shall never understand either society or ourselves, and we shall always be in conflict with society. But if we can understand the process of desire which creates the environmental influences which condition us, then we can go beyond and discover that aloneness which is true individuality, that uniqueness which is a state of creation.

The important thing, then, is not to inquire what is the individual's place in society, but to be aware of how we are conditioned by our beliefs, our desires, our motives. To be aware of the conscious as well as of the unconscious or collective response of the past to the present, to know both the superficial and the deeper layers of one's own thinking—surely, that is of far greater importance than to inquire what is the relationship between the individual and society. If we really see that, then the reformation of society becomes a minor thing. To reform society with-

out understanding ourselves merely creates the need of further reform—and so there is no end to reformation. Whereas, if we can go beyond the limitations of desire, then there is the revolution of individuality; and it is that inward revolution that is so essential to bring about a new world. Merely reforming the world according to a particular ideology has no significance, because revolution based on an idea is no revolution at all. An idea is merely a reaction of the past to the present. There is inward revolution or transformation only when there is the understanding of desire; and it is this inward revolution which is so essential because it alone can bring about a different world.

Question : I love my children, and how am I to educate them to become integrated human beings ?

KRISHNAMURTI: I wonder if we do love our children? We say so, and we take it for granted that we love them. But do we? If we loved our children, would there be wars? If we loved them, would we be nationalistic, divided into separate groups, constantly destroying each other? Would we belong to any particular race or religion in opposition to another? This whole process of separation in life ultimately brings about disintegration, does it not? Surely, war, the ceaseless conflict in society between different groups and different classes, is an indication that we do not love our children. If we really loved them, we would want to save them, would we not? We would want to protect them, we would want them to live as happy, integrated human beings, we would not want them to live in outward insecurity, or be destroyed. But since we have created a world of conflict and misery, in which outward security is non-existent, it indicates, does it not?, that we do not really love our children at all. If we

loved them, we would obviously have a different world. Don't let us become sentimental. But we would have a different world if we really loved our children, because then we would quickly see how to prevent wars; then we would not leave it to the clever politicians, who will never prevent wars; but we would assume direct responsibility for it because we really have the intention of saving the children.

Surely, then, our whole outlook in education, our entire social structure, must be utterly revolutionized, must it not? That means we can no longer use the children for our personal or psychological gratification, as we are doing at present—and that is why we are so easily satisfied, so superficial in what we call 'love'. But if we do not use the children as a means of self-perpetuation, to carry on our name, if we do not use them in any way for our personal gratification, then we will obviously regard them quite differently. Then our concern will be, not to educate the children, but to educate the educator. At present, education is merely to make the children efficient, to teach them a technique, the manner of earning a livelihood; and efficiency obviously brings about ruthlessness. Not that one must be inefficient; but this drive to be efficient, this constant attention to success, must entail struggle, strife, contention.

Now, we cannot have integrated human beings unless we understand the process of disintegration. Integration is not the pursuit of a pattern, the adjustment to an idea, or the following of a particular example. Integration can come about only when one understands the total process of oneself; and there cannot be the understanding of oneself as long as we are living superficially. Our whole process of thought is superficial, the process of the socalled intellect, and to the cultivation of this intellect we give great emphasis. So,

intellectually, which is verbally, we are very far advanced; but inwardly we are insufficient, poor, uncertain, groping, clinging to any form of security. This whole process of thought is a process of disintegration, because thought invariably separates; ideas, like beliefs, never bring people together except in conflicting groups. So, as long as we depend on thought as a means of integration, there must be disintegration. To understand the process of thought is to understand the ways of the self, and then only is there a possibility of integration, which is not imitation.

So, there must not only be the educating of the educator, but we, as mature human beings, must understand our relationship with the children, must we not? And if we really love them, obviously we will see to it that there will be no war, that there will be no struggle in society between the rich and the poor, nor the depredations of the ambitious and the acquisitive who seek power, position, and prestige. But if we want our children to be powerful, to have bigger and better positions, to become more and more successful, surely it indicates that we do not love them: we merely love the acclaim, the glamour, the position, the reflected glory which we hope they will afford us. Therefore, we are encouraging confusion, destruction, and utter misery. I know you are listening to all this, but you will probably return home and continue with those very ways which engender war. Most of us are really not interested in these things. We are interested in immediate answers. We do not want to explore and discover the truth. It is not an economic revolution, but only the discovery of truth, that will free us, that will bring about a new world.

So, the whole question resolves itself into this: not how to educate the children, but how to educate ourselves, and thereby bring about a different society. To do that, we must understand oneself, the

one's desire, the ways of one's thought. We must be aware of everything : of the things about us and in us, of colours, of people, of ideas, of the words we use, of our memories, both personal and collective. It is only when one is fully aware of this whole process that one is alone, a unique individual, and only such people can bring about a new civilization, a new culture.

Question : Can prayer form the link between life and religion ?

KRISHNAMURTI : What do we mean by prayer, and what do we mean by life and religion ? Is life different from religion ? Apparently with most of us it is, so we use prayer as a means of linking life and religion. Why is life separate from religion ? What is religion, and what is life ? Is religion the pursuit of an idea ? When you say religion is the pursuit of God, surely your God is an idea, is it not ? Therefore your God is self-projected. Or, if you deny God and accept another ideology, whether of the left or of the right, it is still a form of religion. So, is religion merely the following of a certain pattern of ideas which promises a reward in the present or in the future ? And is religion different from life, from action, from relationship ?

What do we mean by life ? Life is relationship, is it not ? Can there be life without relationship—relationship to people, to ideas, to things, to property, to nature ? Can there be life in isolation ? And yet, that is what each one of us is pursuing, is it not ? In our ideas, in our relationship to everything about us, we are enclosing, isolating ourselves ; and being isolated, we want to find a relationship or link with what we call religion—which is merely another form of isolation. That is, because in our relationships we are seeking inward security, we make outward security impossible ; and in religion we are also seeking security.

Our God is the ultimate happiness, absolute peace. Surely, such a God is an invention of our minds so as to assure ourselves of permanency in the form of ultimate security ; and then we ask, "Can prayer form the link between life and religion ?" Obviously it can, can it not ? Like everything else in our lives, prayer will help us to be more and more isolated—because that is what we want. In our relationships, in our possessions, we are seeking isolation, which is a form of security ; and in religion also we seek security, permanency. Our God, our virtue, our morality, like our daily activities, are all self-enclosing, self-isolating ; so, we use prayer as a means of uniting the various isolations.

What do we mean by prayer ? And when do we pray ? Surely, we pray only when we are suffering, when we are in misfortune, when there is conflict, confusion, when we are in pain. Do we ever pray when we are happy, when there is rejoicing, when our hearts are full ? Obviously not. We pray only when we are in confusion, when we are uncertain, when we don't know what to do ; and then we turn to somebody for help.

Prayer, then, is generally supplication, is it not ? It is a petition, a demand, a psychological extending of the hand for it to be held, to be filled. And when you ask, you receive, do you not ? But what you get is what you want—it is never what you don't want ; so, what you get is your own projection. That which you receive in response to prayer is shaped by your own fancy, your own limitation, your own conditioning. The more you ask, the more you receive of your own projection, and with that you are satisfied.

But is prayer a process of self-gratification ? What happens when you pray ? You repeat certain words, certain phrases, you take a certain posture ; and when there is a constant repetition of words and phrases, obviously the mind becomes

quiet, does it not? Try it and you will see. The repetition of words makes the mind still. But that is only a trick, is it not? The mind is not really still, it is acquisitive; but you have made it still in order to receive what you want. You want to be helped because you are confused, you are uncertain; and you will receive what you want. But that response to supplication is not the voice of reality; it is the response of your own projection, and also of the collective projection. Because, we all want an answer, do we not? We all want somebody to tell us what wonderful people we are; we all want someone to guide us, to help us in our confusion, in our misery. So, we receive what we want; but what we want is petty, trivial.

So, prayer, which is a supplication, a petition, can never find that reality which is not the outcome of a demand. We demand, supplicate, pray, only when we are in confusion, in sorrow; and not understanding that confusion and sorrow, we turn to somebody else. The answer to prayer is our own projection; in one way or another it is always satisfactory, gratifying, otherwise we would reject it. So, when one has learned the trick of quieting the mind through repetition, one keeps on with that habit; but the answer to supplication must obviously be shaped according to the desire of the person who supplicates.

Now, prayer, supplication, petition, can never uncover that which is not the projection of the mind. To find that which is not the fabrication of the mind, the mind must be quiet—not made quiet by the repetition of words, which is self-hypnosis, nor by any other means of inducing the mind to be still. Stillness that is induced, enforced, is not stillness at all. It is like putting a child in the corner; superficially he may be quiet, but inwardly he is boiling. So a mind that is made quiet by discipline is never really quiet, and stillness that

is induced can never uncover that creative state in which reality comes into being.

So, when we use prayer as a means of linking life and religion, we are only discovering more ways of self-isolation, more ways of disintegration. To put yourself in a state of receptivity through prayer is a process of disintegration, because you want to receive. You may say, 'I do not ask anything, I only put myself in a state of receptivity through prayer'; but that is merely a subtle form of forcing the mind. Enforcement of any kind can never bring about tranquillity. Tranquillity of mind comes into being only with the cessation of thought; and thought ceases when one understands the thinker, the person who asks, demands. Therefore, self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom; and without self-knowledge, merely to pray has very little significance. Prayer cannot open the door to self-knowledge. What opens the door to self-knowledge is constant awareness—not practising awareness, but being aware from moment to moment and discovering. Discovery can never be cumulative. If it is cumulative, it is not discovery. Discovery is new from moment to moment, it is not a continuous state. A man cannot discover if he is accumulating, for accumulation is continuity. Discovery from moment to moment is freedom from the desire which is understood from moment to moment. There is spontaneity of the mind only when you understand the desire that seeks security, permanency, and that desire is the self, the 'me', at all levels. As long as you do not understand yourself wholly, there must be every form of escape, every form of confusion and destruction; and prayers do not help, they merely offer another means of escape. But if you begin to understand the desire that creates confusion, pain, conflict, then you will see that in understanding there comes spontaneity of the mind; then the mind is

really tranquil, without wanting to be or not to be, and only such a mind can understand that which is real.

June 25, 1950.

V

TALK IN NEW YORK

I think it is quite apparent that there must be a fundamental transformation in society, and it can only begin with a radical revolution within each one of us; for society is not very different from ourselves. What we are, society is. The problems of the world are not separate from our problems. We ourselves have projected them, and therefore we are responsible for them; and the fundamental revolution in outward circumstances, however essential and necessary, can be brought about only when there is a radical revolution in ourselves. A radical revolution, a transformation, a psychological upheaval in ourselves, cannot be brought about through any idea or according to any pattern. Revolution based on an ideology is no longer a revolution—it is merely the modified continuity of an old pattern. Thought can never be revolutionary, because thought is the response of memory. Ideas can never bring about a transformation in ourselves, because ideas are merely the continuation of that response, either verbalized, or in the form of symbols, images, and so on. When we desire to bring about a transformation in ourselves according to a pattern pre-established by thought, such a transformation is only the modified continuation of memory; being a projection of ourselves in a different form, it is a continuation of the conditioned state, and therefore it is no transformation at all. Revolution based on an ideology, however inclusive, is not a revolution, because an idea is the pro-

jection of thought, which is memory. The response of memory can never bring about transformation. What can bring about transformation in ourselves, and therefore in society, is to understand the whole process of thinking, which is not different from feeling. Feeling is thinking—though we like to keep them separate and rely either on the one or the other, they are interrelated, they are not dualistic, but a unitary process.

So, as long as we do not understand the whole process of thinking and feeling, obviously there can be no radical revolution within and so without. The understanding of thought, which is feeling, is self-knowledge; and self-knowledge cannot be bought. No study of books, no going to lectures, will give self-knowledge. Self-knowledge comes only when we are aware of ourselves from moment to moment, naturally, spontaneously, easily, without any sense of enforcement; aware, not only of our conscious thinking, but also of the unconscious, with all its content. It is like looking at a map and allowing it to unfold; and the moment we block it by discipline, by any form of practice, the unfolding of self-knowledge comes to an end.

What is important, surely, is to be aware without choice, because choice brings about conflict. The chooser is in confusion, therefore he chooses; if he is not in confusion, there is no choice. Only the person who is confused chooses what he shall do or shall not do. The man who is clear and simple does not choose: what is, is. Action based on an idea is obviously the action of choice, and such action is not liberating; on the contrary, it only creates further resistance, further conflict, according to that conditioned thinking.

So, then, the important thing is to be aware from moment to moment without accumulating the experience which awareness brings; because, the moment you accumulate, you are aware only according to that accumu-

lation, according to that pattern, according to that experience. That is, your awareness is conditioned by your accumulation, and therefore there is no longer observation, but merely translation. Where there is translation, there is choice, and choice creates conflict; and in conflict there can be no understanding.

As we have been discussing for the last four weeks, the difficulty in understanding ourselves exists because we have never given thought to it. We do not see the importance, the significance, of exploring ourselves directly, not according to any idea, pattern, or teacher. The necessity of understanding ourselves, is perceived only when we see that without self-knowledge there can be no basis for thought, for action, for feeling; but self-knowledge is not the outcome of the desire to achieve an end. If we begin to inquire into the process of self-knowledge through fear, through resistance, through authority, or with the desire to gain a result, we shall have what we desire; but it will not be the understanding of the self and the ways of the self. You may place the self at any level, calling it the higher self or the lower self, but it is still the process of thinking; and if the thinker is not understood, obviously his thinking is a process of escape.

Thought and the thinker are one; but it is thought that creates the thinker, and without thought there is no thinker. So, one has to be aware of the process of conditioning, which is thought; and when there is awareness of that process without choice, when there is no sense of resistance, when there is neither condemnation nor justification of what is observed, then we see that the mind is the centre of conflict. In understanding the mind and the ways of the mind, the conscious as well as the unconscious, through dreams, through every word, through every process of thought and action, the mind becomes extraordinarily

quiet; and that tranquillity of the mind is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom cannot be bought, it cannot be learned; it comes into being only when the mind is quiet, utterly still—not made still by compulsion, coercion or discipline. Only when the mind is spontaneously silent, it is possible to understand that which is beyond time.

In considering these questions, as I have often reminded you, there is neither denial nor acceptance. We are going to explore each question, and the answer is not apart from the question. In going into the question as fully and deeply as we can, we shall see the truth of it; and it is that truth that will free us from the problem.

Question : You have shown me the superficiality and the futility of the life I am leading. I should like to change, but I am trapped by habit and environment. Should I leave everything and everyone, and follow you ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Do you think our problems are solved when we follow another? To follow another, no matter who it is, is to deny the understanding of yourself. And it is very easy to follow somebody. The greater the personality, the greater the power, the easier it is to follow; and in the very following you are destroying that understanding, because the follower destroys, he is never the creator, he never brings about understanding. To follow is to deny all understanding, and therefore to deny truth.

Now, if you do not follow, what are you to do? Since, as the questioner says, one is trapped by habit and environment, what is one to do? Surely all that you can do is to understand the trap of habit and environment, the superficiality and the futility of your life. We are always in relationship, are we not?

To be, is to be related ; and if you regard relationship as a trap from which you want to escape, then you will only fall into another trap—the trap of the teacher whom you follow. It may be a little more arduous, a little more inconvenient, a little less comfortable, but it will still be a trap ; because, that also is relationship, and there too there are jealousies, envy, the desire to be the nearest disciple, and all the rest of the nonsense.

So, we are trapped because we do not understand relationship ; and it is difficult to understand relationship if we are condemning, identifying ourselves with something, or if we are using relationship as a means of escape from ourselves, from that which we are. After all, relationship is a mirror, is it not ? Relationship is a mirror in which I can see myself as I am. But to see ourselves directly as we are is very unpleasant, and so we avoid it by condemning it, justifying it, or merely identifying ourselves with it. Without relationship there is no life, is there ? Nothing can exist in isolation. And yet all our efforts are towards being isolated ; relationship for most of us is a process of self-isolation, self-enclosure, and therefore there is friction. When there is friction, misery, pain, suffering, unhappiness, we want to run away, we want to follow someone else, to live in the shadow of another ; and so we turn to the church, to a monastery, or to the latest teacher. They are all the same because they are all escapes, and our turning to them is obviously prompted by the desire to avoid that which is ; and in the very running away we create further misery, further confusion.

So, most of us are trapped, whether we like it or not, because that is our world, that is our society ; and awareness in relationship is the mirror in which we can see ourselves very clearly. To see clearly, there must obviously be no condemnation,

acceptance, justification, or identification. If we are simply aware without choice, then we can observe, not only the superficial reactions of the mind, but also the deep and hidden reactions, which come out in the shape of dreams, or in moments when the superficial mind is quiet and there is spontaneity of response. But if the mind is conditioned, shaped, and bound by a particular belief, surely there can be no spontaneity, and therefore no direct perception of the responses of relationship.

It is important to see, is it not ?, that no one can give us freedom from the conflict of relationship. We can hide behind the screen of words, or follow a teacher, or run to a church, or lose ourselves in a cinema or a book, or keep on attending talks ; but it is only when the fundamental process of thinking is uncovered through awareness in relationship that it is possible to understand and be free of that friction which we instinctively seek to avoid. Most of us use relationship as a means of escape from ourselves, from our own loneliness, from our own inward uncertainty and poverty ; and so we cling to the outer things of relationship, which become very important to us. But if, instead of escaping through relationship, we can look into relationship as a mirror and see very clearly, without any prejudice, exactly what is, then that very perception brings about a transformation of what is, without any effort to transform it. There is nothing to transform about a fact ; it is what it is. But we approach the fact with hesitation, with fear, with a sense of prejudice, and so we are always acting upon the fact and therefore never perceiving the fact as it is. When we see the fact as it is, then that very fact is the truth which resolves the problem.

So, in all this the important thing is, not what another says, however great or stupid he may be, but to be aware of oneself, to see the fact of what is, from moment to moment,

without accumulating. When you accumulate, you cannot see the fact; then you see the accumulation, and not the fact. But when you can see the fact independently of the accumulation, independently of the thought process, which is the response of accumulated experience, then it is possible to go beyond the fact. It is the avoidance of the fact that brings about conflict; but when you recognize the truth of the fact, then there is a quietness of mind in which conflict ceases.

So, do what you will, you cannot escape through relationship; and if you do escape, you will only create further isolation, further misery and confusion; because, to use relationship as a means of self-fulfilment, is to deny relationship. If we look at this problem very clearly, we can see that life is a process of relationship; and if, instead of understanding relationship, we seek to withdraw from it, enclosing ourselves in ideas, in superstitions, in various forms of addiction, these self-enclosures only create more of the very conflict we are trying to avoid.

Question : What is wisdom? Is it dissimilar from knowledge?

KRISHNAMURTI: What is knowledge? Surely, knowledge is the accumulating principle in all of us, which is memory. The acquisitive process is knowledge, is it not? Knowledge is experience and memory. The more we accumulate experience, the more we know. Knowing is a process of verbalizing; and that which has been accumulated, which is experience, memory, or knowledge, can never bring wisdom. Knowledge is the result of experience, and there is experience only when there is an experiencer who is accumulating. The experiencer is the result of his own accumulations, experiences, and knowledge; and what he experiences is according to

his conditioning. Therefore, the more he experiences, the more he is conditioned, weighed down. When he experiences, he can only experience according to his background; so the background dictates the knowledge, the translation of experience. Experience, the translation of a fact, cannot bring understanding. Understanding comes only with the suppression of knowledge.

After all, we experience according to our belief. If I believe that there is no God, obviously I experience according to my belief, because the background, the conditioning, the training, dictates and translates my experiences; and if I believe in God, then my experience is according to my conditioning as a believer. So, experiencing is a process of the response of the conditioned mind; and where there is knowledge, or the accumulation of experience, of memory, of words, symbols, images, there can be no understanding. Understanding can come only when there is freedom from knowledge. After all, when you have a problem, the more you think about it, worry over it, the less you understand it; but if you can look at it freely, without translating it, without bringing in all the background of your tradition, of your experiences, then you will see that understanding comes out of it.

So, understanding is not the result of accumulation, and wisdom is not knowledge. Wisdom is independent, it is dissimilar from knowledge. Wisdom is from moment to moment, whereas knowledge can never be free from the past, from time. Wisdom is free from time, and knowledge is the very process of time, and the two cannot possibly be joined together. The man who knows can never be wise, because the very knowledge of what he has, denies wisdom. Knowledge is the process of time, which is the accumulation of experience; and wisdom is freedom from time, which is experience from moment to mo-

ment without the process of accumulation.

Question : Though I am young, I am haunted by the fear of death. How am I to overcome this fear ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Surely, anything that is overcome has to be overcome again, has it not ? When you conquer your enemy, you have to reconquer him again and again. That is why wars continue. The moment you vanquish one desire, there is another desire to be vanquished. So, that which is overcome can never be understood. Overcoming is merely a form of suppression, and you can never be free of that which is suppressed. So, the overcoming of fear is merely the postponement of fear.

Our problem, then, is not how to overcome fear of death, but to understand the whole process of death ; and understanding it, is not a matter of being young or old. There are various forms of death, for the old as well as for the young. All of us are conditioned by our past, by conformity, by the desire for our own advancement, by the subtle accumulation of power ; and though we are outwardly active, we may be inwardly dead. So, to understand this process of death needs a great deal of exploration, and not merely adhering to a particular form of belief—that there is, or is not, a continuity after death. Belief in life after death may give you an ideological consolation ; and there may be, and probably there is, a form of continuity. But then what ? What continues ? Can that which continues ever be creative ? And where there is continuity is there not always the fear of ending ? So, death is a process of time, is it not ?

What do we mean by time ? There is chronological time, but there is also another kind of time, is there not ? It is the psychological process That is, we want to

continue ; and the very desire to continue creates the process of time and the fear of not continuing. It is this fear of not continuing that we are concerned with ; it is ending, of which we are afraid. We are afraid of death because we think that through continuity we shall achieve something, we shall be happy.

After all, what is it that continues ? If we can really understand that, if we can actually experience it as we are sitting here, and not merely listen to words, then perhaps we shall know what it is to die from moment to moment ; and knowing death, we shall know life, because the two are not very different. If we do not know how to live, we are afraid of death ; but if we know how to live, then there is no death. Most of us do not know what living is, and so we regard death as a negation of life ; and therefore we are afraid of death. But if we can understand what living is, then we shall know of death in the very process of living. To find that out, we must understand what we mean by continuity.

What is this extraordinary craving to continue, that each one of us has ? And what is it that continues ? Surely, that which continues is name, form, experience, knowledge, and various memories. That is what we are, is it not ? To divide yourself into the higher and the lower self is irrelevant—you are still merely the sum total of all that. Though you may say, 'No, I am more than that, I am a spiritual entity', that very assertion is part of the process of thinking, which is the conditioned and conditioning response of memory. There are others who are conditioned to say, 'We are not spiritual, we are just the product of environment'. So, you are your memories, your experiences, your thoughts. At whatever level you place the thought process, you are still that ; and you are afraid that when death comes, that process, which is the 'you', will come to an end. Or, you rationalize

it and say, 'I will continue in some form after death, and come back in the next life'.

Now, a spiritual entity obviously cannot continue, because it is beyond time. Continuity implies time—yesterday, today, and tomorrow; therefore, that which is timeless can have no continuity. To say, 'I am a spiritual entity', is a comforting thought; but the very process of thinking about it eateth it in the net of time; therefore, it cannot be timeless, and therefore it is not spiritual.

So, what we have is only our thinking, which is also feeling. We have nothing but our name, our form, our family, our clothes and furniture, our memories and experiences, our responses, traditions, vanities, and prejudices. That is all we have; and that we want to continue. We are afraid it will all come to an end, that we shall be unable to say, 'This for which I have struggled is all mine'. Now, can that which continues ever renew itself? Obviously not. That which continues cannot be reborn, renewed; it can merely have a continuity. Only that which comes to an end can renew itself. There is creation only when there is an ending. But we are afraid to end, we are afraid to die. We want to carry on from yesterday, through today, to tomorrow. We are building Utopias and sacrificing the present to the future, liquidating people because of the desire for continuity. If we examine very closely what it is that continues, we will see that it is only memory in various forms; and because the mind clings to memory, it is afraid of death. But surely, only in dying, in not accumulating, is there that which is beyond time. The mind cannot possibly conceive, formulate, or experience, that which is not of time. It can experience only that which is of time; because, the mind is the result of time, of the past.

So, as long as the mind is afraid of coming to an end, it clings to its own continuity; and that which continues

must obviously decay. Our difficulty is to die to all the things that we have accumulated, to all the experiences of yesterday. After all, that is death, is it not?—to be uncertain, to be in a state of vulnerability. The man who is certain can never know that which is immortal, that which is beyond time. The man of knowledge can never know death, which is beyond time, the unknown. It is only when we die from moment to moment to the things of yesterday and understand the whole significance of continuity, that there is the unknown, a new thing. That which continues can never know the truth, the unknown, the new; it can only know its own projection. Most of us live through accumulation; therefore, yesterday and tomorrow become far more important than the present.

There must obviously be chronological time, otherwise you will miss your train; but as long as we are caught in the projection of the mind, which is psychological time, there is no ending; and that which has continuity is not immortal. Only that which comes to an end is timeless, and that alone can know the immortal.

Question: There are several systems of meditation, both Occidental and Oriental. Which do you recommend?

KRISHNAMURTI: To understand what is right meditation is really a very complex problem, and to know how to meditate, how to be in the state of meditation, is important; but to follow any system, whether Occidental or Oriental, is not to meditate. When you follow a system, all that you learn is to conform, to shape the mind to a particular pattern or drive it along a particular groove. If you pursue it ardently enough, you will produce the result that the system guarantees; but surely, that is not meditation. There is a lot of nonsense taught about meditation, especially

by those people who come from the Orient. (Laughter.) Please don't laugh or clap—this is not that kind of meeting. We are trying to find out what meditation is.

You can see that those who pursue a system, who drive the mind into certain practices, obviously condition the mind according to that formula. Therefore, the mind is not free. It is only the free mind that can discover, not a mind conditioned according to any system, whether Oriental or Occidental. Conditioning is the same, by whatever name you may call it. To see the truth there must be freedom, and a mind that is conditioned according to a system can never see the truth.

Now, to see the truth that there can be no freedom through the discipline of any system, requires the understanding of the process of the mind; because, the mind clings to systems, to beliefs, to particular formulas. To discover the truth of that, surely you have to see that you are caught in a system; and to be aware of the process by which the mind gets caught in a system, is meditation. To be aware of the whole process of thinking is self-knowledge, is it not? So, meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge. Without knowing the process of your own thinking, merely to sit in a corner and go off into silence, or whatever you do, is not meditation—it is just a wish to become, to acquire, to gain something. And obviously, concentration is not meditation. Merely focusing the mind on an idea, an image, or a phrase, and excluding all other thoughts, is not meditation, is it? You may learn concentration in that way, but concentration is exclusion; and when the mind excludes, it is not free.

Why do we want to focus the mind on an image, or an idea, or practise a system of so-called meditation—the more mysterious the better? Because we think that by concentration, or through prayer, the constant repetition of certain words, the mind will

be made quiet. As I said, concentration is a process of exclusion. We choose a particular idea or thought and dwell on it, and while we are forcing the mind to concentrate on it, other thoughts come in; so, there is a conflict going on, and we spend our energy in this wasteful battle. But if we can be open to each thought as it arises and understand it, then we shall see that the mind does not revert to any particular thought. The mind reverts to a thought because it has not understood it; that is, what is not understood is repeated over and over again, and mere exclusion will not prevent it. So, concentration, which is exclusion, is not meditation. Most of us want to live exclusively, with our private memories, private experiences, private knowledge; and concentration, which we call meditation, is merely a further process of self-enclosure, self-isolation. But the mind can never be free through isolation, however wide your projected idea may be.

Now, you can force the mind to be quiet through what is called prayer, the constant repetition of words; but when the mind is hypnotized into quietness, is that a state of meditation? Surely, that only dulls the mind, does it not? Though the mind may be pacified through discipline, which is based on the desire for particular results, such a mind is obviously not a free mind. Freedom can never come through discipline. Though we think we must discipline ourselves in order to be free, the beginning determines the end; and if the mind is disciplined at the beginning, it will be disciplined at the end; therefore, it can never be free. But if we can understand the whole process of discipline, control, suppression, sublimation, substitution, then there will be freedom from the very beginning; for the means and the end are one, they are not two separate processes, either politically or religiously.

So, discipline through concentration is not meditation, nor are the various

forms of prayer. Those are all tricks by which the mind is forced to be still; and a mind that is made still through will, through desire, can never be free. If we really look at all these things—concentration, prayer, systems of meditation, and all the various tricks that we learn to quiet, to hypnotize the mind—we shall discover that they are the ways of thought, the ways of the self; and this discovery is the beginning of inattention, which is the beginning of self-knowledge. Without knowing yourself, merely to concentrate, to conform to a pattern, to follow a system, to quiet the mind through a discipline, only leads to further misery, further confusion. But if you begin to know the ways of your own thought by being choicelessly aware of yourself in relationship, in your talking, in your walking, when you are observing a bird or looking at somebody else, then, in that awareness, the responses of your conditioned state come into being; and in that spontaneity there is the discovery of yourself as yourself. And the more you are aware of yourself without choice, without justification or condemnation, the more there is freedom. It is this freedom that is the process of meditation. But you cannot cultivate freedom, any more than you can cultivate love. Freedom comes into being, not through the search for it, but when you understand the whole process and structure of yourself.

Meditation, then, is the beginning of self-knowledge. When you begin very near, you can go very far; and then you will see that thought, which is the projection of the mind, comes to an end of itself without being compelled, forced. Then there is silence—not the silence that is willed, created by the mind, but a silence that is not of time; and in that silence there is the state of creation, the timelessness which is reality.

So, without understanding the ways of thought, merely to force the mind to meditate is an utter waste of time

and energy, and only creates more confusion, more misery. But to understand the process of the self as the thinker, to know the ways of the self as thought, is the beginning of wisdom. For wisdom to be, there must be the understanding of the accumulating process which is the thinker. Without understanding the thinker, meditation has no meaning; because, whatever he projects is according to his own conditioning, and that is obviously not reality. Only when the mind understands the whole process of itself as thought, is it capable of being free, and only then does the timeless come into being.

July 2, 1950

I

TALK IN SEATTLE

I think it is important to learn the art of hearing. Most of us listen only to that which is convenient, pleasurable; we do not hear those things that might affect us deeply, that are disturbing, that contradict our particular beliefs and opinions. And surely, it is important that we should know how to listen without making a tremendous effort to understand. When we make an effort to understand, our energy goes into the effort rather than into the process of understanding. Very few can listen without resistance, without creating barriers between themselves and the speaker; but if we can put aside our particular opinions, our accumulated knowledge and experience, and listen easily, without effort, then perhaps we shall be able to understand the nature of the fundamental and radical transformation that is so essential in a crisis of the present kind.

Now, it is obvious that there must be some kind of change. We are at the edge of a precipice; and the crisis is not limited to a particular group, religion, or people, but it is a crisis

that involves us all. Whether you are an American or a Korean, a Japanese or a German, a Russian or a Hindu, you are affected by this crisis. It is a world crisis; and to understand it fully, if one is at all serious about it, one has obviously to begin with a fundamental understanding of oneself. The world is not different from each one of us. The world's problems are your problems and mine. This is not a histrionic assertion, but an actual fact. If you examine the matter closely, go into it fully, you will see that the collective problems are the problems that confront each one of us individually. I do not think there is a division between the collective problems and those of the individual. The world is what we are; what we are, we project, and that to us becomes the world problem.

So, to understand this extraordinarily complex and ever-increasing problem that we see in the world, we have to understand ourselves—which does not mean that we must become so subjective, so inward-turned, that we lose contact with external affairs. Such an action, such a process, is meaningless, it has no validity at all. But if we can see that the world crisis—the confusion, the tragedy, the appalling murders and disasters that are taking place and are going to take place, this whole beastly mess—if we can see that all this is the result of our own daily life and action, of our particular beliefs, both religious and national; if we can see that this world cataclysm is a projection of ourselves and is not independent of us, then our examination of the problem will be neither subjective nor objective, but will come about through quite a different approach.

Now, we generally approach a problem of this kind either objectively or subjectively, do we not? We try to understand it either on the objective or on the subjective level; and the difficulty is that the problem is neither purely subjective nor purely objective, but is a combination of the two.

It is both a social and a psychological process, and that is why no specialist, no economist, no psychologist, no follower of a system, whether of the right or of the left, can ever solve this problem. The specialists and experts can attack the problem only in their own particular fields, they never treat it as a total process; and to understand it, one must approach it in its totality. So, our approach to the problem can obviously be neither subjective nor objective, but we must be capable of seeing it as a total process.

To understand the world crisis as a total process, one has to begin with oneself. Outwardly there is constant war, conflict, confusion, misery, and strife; and through it all there is the search for security, for happiness. Surely, these outward problems are the result, the projection, of our own inward confusion, conflict, and misery. Therefore, in order to solve the external problems, which are not independent of our inward struggles and pains, we must obviously begin to understand the process of our own thinking; that is, there must be self-knowledge. Without knowing ourselves fundamentally, both the conscious and the unconscious, there is no basis for thinking, is there? If I do not know myself deeply, at all the different levels, what basis is there for my thinking, for my action? Though this has been said over and over again by every preacher since the beginning of time, we go on disregarding it because we think that by environmental change, by altering outward circumstances, by bringing about an economic revolution, we can transform fundamentally the process of our thinking. But surely, if we can look at the problem a little more closely and ardently, we will see that mere external alterations can never bring about a fundamental revolution. Without understanding the whole process of the self, of the 'me', the process of our own thinking, the inward confusion in which

we live will always overcome the cunning reconstruction of outer circumstances.

So, it is important, is it not ?, for those who are really serious, who are in earnest, who are not just fliprant or pursuing some sectarian belief—surely, it is important for such people to begin to understand the process of their own thinking. Because, after all, our thought is the response of our particular conditioning ; and there would be no thought if there were no conditioning. That is, whether you are a socialist, a communist, a capitalist, a Catholic, a Protestant, a Hindu, or what you will, your thinking is the response of that conditioning ; and without understanding that conditioning or background, which is the 'you', whatever you do, whatever you think, must obviously be the response of that conditioning. So, to bring about a fundamental revolution, a transformation in oneself, there must be the understanding of the background, of the conditioning influences which create the process of thinking ; and this self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom.

Most of us, unfortunately, seek wisdom through books, through listening to somebody ; we think we will understand life by following experts or by joining philosophical societies or religious organizations. Surely, they are all escapes, are they not ? Because, after all, we have to understand ourselves ; and the understanding of oneself is a very complex process. We do not exist at only one level ; our structure of being is at several levels, with different entities all in conflict with each other. Without understanding that whole process of the self, we cannot finally solve any problem, whether political, economic, or social. The basic problem is one of human relationship, and to solve that, we must begin to understand the total process of ourselves. To bring about a change

in the world, which is obviously essential, we must be aware of all our psychological responses, must we not ? To be aware of our responses is to observe them without choice, without condemnation or justification—just to see the whole process of our own thinking in the midst of relationship, in the midst of action. Then we begin to examine the problem in its totality, that is, we are aware of its full scope ; and then we shall see how our responses are conditioned by our particular background, and how those conditioned responses are contributing to the chaos in the world. So, self-knowledge is the beginning of freedom.

Now, to discover anything, to understand what is truth, reality, or God, there must be freedom. Freedom can never come through a belief ; on the contrary, there is freedom only when the conditioning influences of belief, and of the process of memory, are understood. When there is that understanding of its own process, then the mind is really still, spontaneously silent ; and in that silence, which cannot come through any enforcement, there is freedom. Then only is there a possibility of discovering what is real. So, there can be freedom only with the understanding of the self, of the 'me', of the whole process of our thinking.

There are some questions, and in considering them, may I suggest that you and I should both try to discover the truth of the matter, and not merely wait for an answer. Life has no categorical answer of 'yes' or 'no'. We must go into each problem very deeply ; and to go into it deeply, we must begin very near and follow it closely without missing a step. And if we can take the journey together and discover the truth of these problems, then no expert, no pressure of public opinion, no immature thinking, can ever obscure that which has been discovered.

Question : What is my responsibility towards the present world crisis ?

KRISHNAMURTI : First of all, is the world crisis something apart from you ? Is the present world catastrophe different from the conflict of our daily existence ? After all, this disastrous world situation is the collective result of our separative beliefs, of our narrow patriotism, of our religious bigotries, petty antagonisms, and economic frontiers. It is the result of our daily competition, of our ruthless efficiency, is it not ?

So, the world crisis is a projection of ourselves ; it is not separate from us. And to bring about a fundamental change in the world, surely we must individually break down and be free from those limitations, barriers, and conditioning influences, which create this universal horror and confusion. But our difficulty is that we do not see that we are responsible. We do not really see that nationalism divides people, that so-called religions, with their dogmas, beliefs, and rituals, are separating influences. Though they preach the unity of man, they themselves are a means of setting man against man. We do not see the truth of that, nor of the fact that our own limited thoughts, experiences, and knowledge, are again a separative process ; and where there is separation, obviously there is disintegration and ultimately war.

Our life, then, is actually a process of disintegration ; in it there is nothing creative. We are like gramophone records, repeating certain experiences, certain slogans, and reproducing the knowledge which we have acquired. In repeating, we make a lot of noise, and we think we are living ; but this mechanical repetition is obviously a process of disintegration which, when projected, becomes a world crisis of ultimate destruction. So, the world crisis is a

projection of our daily existence. What we are makes the world around us. Therefore, for those who are really serious, it is of the highest importance to bring about a fundamental change in what we are ; because, only in the transformation of ourselves can there be the cessation of this horror that is going on. But unfortunately, most of us are lazy. We want others to do the work for us, to tell us what to do. We are satisfied with our little knowledge, with our little experience, with trite newspaper slogans ; and gradually we become set in our narrow ways, we lose the vitality of change, the quickness, the alertness of mind.

So, the problem is not to find out your responsibility towards the world crisis, but to see that what you are, the world is. Without a fundamental transformation in yourself, world crises will go on multiplying, becoming more and more disastrous. The problem, then, is how to bring about a fundamental transformation in oneself ; and we shall discuss this during the next four weeks as we go along. It is not an easy problem. Transformation is not mere change, a mere modification in one's attitude. Such change is superficial, it can never be fundamental. So, we must think about the whole problem quite differently, which we will do in the course of the coming weeks.

Question : Is the individual the instrument of society, or does society exist for the individual ?

KRISHNAMURTI : This is an important question, is it not ? Let us think it out together and find the truth of the matter without depending on the opinion of any authority or any expert. Authorities and experts change their views according to their convenience, according to their latest discoveries, and so on ; but if we can discover the truth of the matter for

ourselves, then we shall not be dependent on others.

Now, this question implies that the world is divided, does it not? There are those who assert, with enormous knowledge in addition to their personal inclination and idiosyncrasy, that the individual is the instrument of society—which means that the individual is not important at all. There is a tremendous group of people who maintain this, and who therefore give all their energies to the reconstruction of society. And there are those who believe with equal emphasis that the individual is above society, that society exists for the individual.

So, you and I have to find out what the truth of this matter is. How are we going to find out? Surely, not by being persuaded to accept this or that opinion, but by going into the whole problem very deeply. That is, our problem is not whether society exists for the individual, or the individual for society, but to find out what is the individual. I hope I am making myself clear. There are those who assert that the individual is not important, and that only society is important; and there are others who maintain that the individual is beyond society. But to find out the truth of the matter, surely we must inquire into the problem of what is individuality.

Are you an individual? You may think you are an individual, because you have your own house, your own name, your own family, your own bank account; you have the particular experiences, the memories, both private and collective, of a separate person. But does that constitute individuality? Because, after all, you are conditioned by your environment, are you not? You are an American, or a Russian, or a Hindu, with all its implications; you have a certain ideology imposed upon you by your society, either of the left or of the right. You are educated in certain ways by your

society. Your religious beliefs are a result of your education, of your environmental influence. You believe in God, or disbelieve in God, according to your conditioning. So, you, as an entity, are the result of social or environmental conditioning, are you not? That is, you are a conditioned entity; and is a conditioned entity a true individual? Individuality is unique, is it not? Otherwise it is not individuality. And that which is unique is creative, it is beyond all conditioning, it is not limited, controlled by thought. So, there can be individuality only when there is freedom from conditioning; and as long as you are conditioned as a Hindu, a Buddhist, a communist, a capitalist, a Russian, or what you will, there can be no individuality.

Now, society is only concerned with creating an entity which is efficient for its own purposes, including war; it is obviously not concerned with bringing about an individual who is unique, creative. So, the problem is, not whether the individual is or is not the instrument of society, but whether we ourselves are individuals; and to find out if we are individuals, surely we must be aware of our conditioning. As long as we are not free from our particular conditioning, there cannot be the creative uniqueness of individuality. There can be individuality only when there is freedom from all conditioning, whether of the left or of the right; and that freedom alone brings about the creative uniqueness of the individual.

You may say that I am giving quite a different significance to that word 'individual'. But I don't think we are individuals, are we? And by recognizing that we are not individuals, that we merely respond according to our conditioning—by recognizing that fact, we can go beyond it; but if we deny the fact, then it is obviously impossible to go beyond. And most of us will deny the fact,

because we like what we are. We like to be comfortable in our own little backyard of thinking—and for that we will fight. But if we can understand our conditioning and the responses of that conditioning, which we so proudly call individuality, if we can be aware of all that, then there is a possibility of going beyond and discovering what is true creation.

Question : There are many concepts of God in the world today. What is your thought concerning God ?

KRISHNAMURTI : First of all, we must find out what we mean by a concept. What do we mean by the process of thinking ? Because, after all, when we formulate a concept, let us say, of God, our formula or concept must be the result of our conditioning, must it not ? If we believe in God, surely our belief is the result of our environment. There are those who are trained from childhood to deny God, and those who are trained to believe in God—as most of you have been. So, we formulate a concept of God according to our training, according to our background, according to our idiosyncrasies, likes and dislikes, hopes and fears. Obviously, then, as long as we do not understand the process of our own thinking, mere concepts of God have no value at all, have they ? Because, thought can project anything it likes. It can create God, and deny God. Each person can invent or destroy God according to his inclinations, pleasures, and pains. Therefore, as long as thought is active, formulating, inventing, that which is beyond time can never be discovered. God, or reality, is to be discovered only when thought comes to an end.

Now, when you ask, "What is your thought concerning God?", you have already formulated your own thought, have you not ? Thought can

create God, and experience that which it has created ; but surely, that is not true experience. It is only its own projection that thought experiences, and therefore it is not real. But if you and I can see the truth of this, then perhaps we shall experience something much greater than a mere projection of thought.

At the present time, when there is greater and greater insecurity outwardly, there is obviously a yearning for inward security. Since we cannot find security outside, we seek it in an idea, in thought ; and so we create *that which we call God*, and that concept becomes our security. Now a mind that seeks security surely cannot find the real, the true. To understand that which is beyond time, the fabrications of thought must come to an end. Thought cannot exist without words, symbols, images ; and only when the mind is quiet, free of its own creations, is there a possibility of finding out what is real. So, merely to ask if there is or is not God, is an immature response to the problem, is it not ? And to formulate opinions about God is really childish.

To experience, to realize, that which is beyond time, we must obviously understand the process of time. The mind is the result of time, it is based on the memories of yesterday ; and is it possible to be free from the multiplication of yesterdays, which is the process of time ? Surely, this is a very serious problem, it is not a matter of belief or disbelief. Believing and disbelieving is a process of ignorance ; whereas, understanding the time-binding quality of thought brings freedom, in which alone there can be discovery. But most of us want to believe, because it is much more convenient ; it gives us a sense of security, a sense of belonging to the group. Surely, this very belief separates us ; because, you believe in one thing, and I believe in another. So,

belief acts as a harrier, it is a process of disintegration.

What is important, then, is not the cultivation of belief or disbelief, but to understand the process of the mind. It is the mind, it is thought, that creates time. Thought is time, and whatever thought projects must be of time; therefore, thought cannot possibly go beyond itself. To discover what is beyond time, thought must come to an end—and that is a most difficult thing; because, the ending of thought does not come about through discipline, through control, through denial or suppression. Thought ends only when we understand the whole process of thinking; and to understand thinking there must be self-knowledge. Thought is the self, thought is the word which identifies itself as the 'me'; and at whatever level, high or low, the self is placed, it is still within the field of thought. To find God, that which is beyond time, we must understand the process of thought, that is, the process of oneself. And the self is very complex; it is not at any one level, but is made up of many thoughts, many entities, each in contradiction with the other. There must be a constant awareness of them all—an awareness in which there is no choice, no condemnation or comparison; that is, there must be the capacity to see things as they are without distorting or translating them. The moment we judge or translate what is seen, we distort it according to our background. To discover reality or God, there can be no belief, because acceptance or denial is a barrier to discovery. We all want to be secure, both outwardly and inwardly; and the mind must understand that the search for security is an illusion. It is only the mind which is insecure, completely free from any form of possession, that can discover—and this is an arduous task. It does not mean retiring into the woods, or to a monastery, or isolating oneself in some

peculiar belief; on the contrary, nothing can exist in isolation. To be, is to be related; and it is only in the midst of relationship that we can spontaneously discover ourselves as we are. It is this discovery of ourselves as we are, without any sense of condemnation or justification, that brings about a fundamental transformation in what we are; and that is the beginning of wisdom.

July 16, 1950

II

TALK IN SEATTLE

With most of us, life is a constant struggle, a constant battle, within ourselves, and therefore outwardly. This battle, this conflict, seems never to end; and the difficulty with most of us is that we are always trying to conform our lives to certain standards, principles or ideals. Now, the cessation of conflict does not come about through a process of conformity, either to the past or to the future, but through understanding the events, the happenings, of our daily life as they arise from moment to moment; and we are incapable of that full comprehension of events as long as we hold to a particular outlook, opinion, experience or idea.

Life is relationship; and in relationship, most of us seek isolation. If we observe closely, we will see that our very thinking and action are self-enclosing, and this process of self-enclosing we call experience. Relationship is not only with people, but with ideas and things; and as long as we do not understand this self-enclosing process in relationship, we are bound to have conflict, because there must be conflict as long as there is isolation.

Isolation takes many and extraordinary forms. There is the isolation of memory, both personal and collective; there is isolation in the form of belief; and there is the isolation of the ex-

periences that one has accumulated and to which the mind clings. This whole process of isolation, of separation, is obviously a disintegrating factor in our lives—and that is exactly what is happening at the present time in the world. Inwardly, as individuals, and outwardly, as nationalistic and religious groups, we are seeking isolation in self-enclosing ideals, beliefs, dogmas, and opinions; and as long as this process of isolation continues, there must be conflict. Conflict can never be overcome; because, a thing that is overcome has to be conquered again and again. Conflict ceases only in understanding the process of relationship. We cannot live in isolation, because life is relationship. To be, is to be related; and without understanding relationship, obviously there must be conflict. So, our problem is to understand relationship—our relationship with people, with property, and with ideas.

Does understanding depend on experience? What do we mean by experience? Experience is a reaction, the response to a challenge, is it not? If the response is not adequate, there is conflict; and the response can never be adequate as long as we do not understand relationship. To understand relationship, we must understand the whole background and process of our thinking. Thought, the whole structure of our thinking, is based on the past; and as long as we do not understand this background, relationship remains inevitably a process of conflict.

To understand thought, which is the process of the self at whatever level it may be placed, is arduous; because, thought has no break in continuity. That is why, to follow the movement, the reactions of thought, which is the self, the mind must be extraordinarily subtle, quick, and adaptable. The self, the 'me', is obviously made up of the qualities, the tendencies, the prejudices and idiosyncrasies of the mind; and without understanding that whole

structure of thinking, merely to solve the outer problems of relationship is obviously futile.

So understanding does not depend on the process of thought. Thought is never new, but relationship is always new; and thought approaches this thing that is vital, real, new, with the background of the old. That is, thought tries to understand relationship according to the memories, patterns, and conditioning of the old—and hence there is conflict. Before we can understand relationship, we must understand the background of the thinker, which is to be aware of the whole process of thought without choice; that is, we must be capable of seeing things as they are without translating them according to our memories, our preconceived ideas, which are the outcome of past conditioning.

To understand conflict, we must understand relationship; and the understanding of relationship does not depend on memory, on habit, on what has been or what should be. It depends on choiceless awareness from moment to moment; and if we go into it deeply, we shall see that in that awareness there is no accumulative process at all. The moment there is accumulation, there is a point from which to examine, and that point is conditioned; and hence, when we regard relationship from a fixed point, there must be pain, there must be conflict.

Life, then, is a process of constant relationship with ideas, with people, and with things; and as long as we have a fixed point or centre of recognition, which is the consciousness of the 'me', there must be conflict. From the centre of recognition, that accumulative principle of the 'me', we examine all our relationships, and therefore there must be a constant isolation; and it is this isolation, this desire to be separate, that creates conflict and struggle.

So, our problem in life, in living, is to understand the desire to be sepa-

rate. Nothing can live in isolation ; but all our efforts based on desire must eventually be exclusive, separative. Therefore, desire is the process of disintegration ; and desire expresses itself in many ways, subtle and gross, conscious and unconscious. But if we can be aware of desire—not as a discipline, but by being choicelessly aware of it from moment to moment—, then we shall see that there comes a swift spontaneity of discovery of that which is true ; and it is truth that gives freedom, not all our efforts to be free.

Truth is not cumulative ; it is to be seen and understood from moment to moment. The person who accumulates, whether knowledge, property, or ideas, who is caught up in the self-enveloping process of relationship, is incapable of seeing truth. The man of knowledge can never know truth, because the process of knowledge is cumulative ; and the mind which accumulates is caught in time, and therefore cannot know the timeless.

Now, how are we to understand the process of the self, the 'me' ? Without understanding this process, there is no basis for action, for thought. To understand the self, we must understand relationship ; because, it is in the mirror of relationship that the self is seen. But the self can be seen clearly as it is, only when there is no condemnation, no comparison ; that is, when we are capable of observation, alert passiveness, in which all choice has come to an end. As long as the mind is accumulating, it is not free ; but when it is capable of perceiving without choice that which is, then that very perception is its own freedom. It is only when the mind is free that it is capable of discovery, and in that freedom there is the cessation of conflict and pain.

I have several questions, and in considering them, let us examine the problem and discover the truth of it together. To do that, the mind must be quick, pliable, actively aware. No problem has an answer, and if we

seek an answer, it will lead us away from the problem ; but if we understand that problem, the problem comes to an end. As long as we seek an answer to any problem, that problem will continue, because the desire to find an answer prevents the understanding of the problem itself. So, our approach to the problem is extraordinarily important, is it not ? The man who is looking for the solution to a problem has his whole concentration placed on the discovery of the answer, and so he is really incapable of looking directly at the problem. But if we can look at the problem without the desire to find an answer, we shall see that the problem is quickly resolved, because then the problem reveals its whole content. So, if I may suggest, let us in that manner examine these questions together.

Question: What system would give man the greatest physical security ?

KRISHNAMURTI: There are several things involved in this question, are there not ? What do we mean by a system ? And what do we mean by physical security ? By a system we mean an ideology either of the left or of the right, do we not ? And can any ideology guarantee physical security ? Can a system, an idea, a doctrine, however promising, howeverunningly and subtly thought out, however erudite, give security ? A political structure built around ideas, knowledge, and experience—that is what we mean by a system, is it not ? It is an ideology in opposition to other ideologies ; and can that ever bring physical security ?

What do we mean by idea ? Idea is a process of thinking, is it not ? One thinks, and idea is merely the result of accumulated knowledge and experience ; and we look to idea as a means of physical security. Is, to put it differently, there are

problems: starvation, war, unemployment, overpopulation, erosion of the soil and so on. Take starvation — though it is perhaps not the problem in this country that it is in the East. Two opposing systems, the left and the right, try to solve it. That is, we approach the problem of starvation with an idea, with a formula — and then fight over the formula. So, the formula, the system, becomes more important than the problem of starvation. The problem is starvation, not what idea, what formula to use. But we are more interested in the idea than in the problem of starvation; and so we group ourselves against each other according to our ideas, and fight it out, liquidate each other; and starvation continues.

So, the important thing is to have the capacity to face the problem, to tackle it directly, and not look to a system; and by understanding the problem, we will naturally resolve it. That is entirely different from coming to it with a formula, is it not? After all, there is enough scientific knowledge to solve the problem of starvation. Why is it not done? Because of our nationalism, our power politics, and the innumerable other absurdities of which we are so proud. It is therefore a psychological problem, and not merely an economic problem. No expert can solve it, because the expert looks at it from his particular point of view according to his formula. That is why it is important to understand the whole process of one's own thinking.

Now, can we have physical security as long as we are seeking psychological security? This is another problem which is also involved in this question. We have seen what is implied when we look to a system in order to have physical security; and now we are trying to find out what we mean by physical security, and if physical security is independent of psychological security. Is physical security assured if we are seeking

psychological security? That is, if we use property as a means of psychological security, are we not creating physical insecurity? Property becomes extraordinarily important to us because psychologically we are weak; it gives us power, position, prestige, and so we put a fence around it and call it 'mine'. To protect it, we create a police force, an army, and from that arise nationalism and war. So, in the very desire for psychological security, we bring about physical insecurity. Therefore, physical security is entirely dependent on whether or not we are seeking psychological security. If we do not seek psychological security in any form, then obviously there is a possibility of achieving physical security.

Physical security, then, depends upon the understanding of our own psychological process, the whole structure of our inner being; and as long as we do not understand ourselves, no system can give us physical security. A revolution based on an idea can never be a revolution, and can therefore never bring about physical security, because it is merely a modified continuation of what is. Revolution, transformation, is not the outcome of thinking; it comes into being only when thought ceases. Our difficulty is that we are so caught up with Utopian promises that we are willing to sacrifice the present for the future; and in the very sacrificing of the present is the destruction of the future. Only when we understand the fact of what is, without translating it according to any ideology, is there a possibility of having the physical security which is so essential.

Question: I seek God, truth, understanding. How am I to proceed in finding them?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do not seek, for what you seek is obviously your own projection, is it not? When you say, "I seek God, truth, understanding",

you have an idea of what truth or God is, and you are after that; and you will find what you seek—but it will not be God; it will merely be the image of your idea. Only the man who does not seek will find reality—which does not mean that we must become apathetic, lazy, sluggish. On the contrary, not to seek is extremely difficult; it requires great understanding, deep comprehension. When the mind is seeking, it is projecting, manufacturing, fabricating; and it is only when the mind is still—not disciplined to be still, but spontaneously quiet—that there is a possibility of truth coming into being. The man who struggles and tries to seek is caught in the process of conflict, is he not? Because he is continuously seeking, searching out, his mind is agitated, it is never still; and how can such a mind ever be quiet? Such a mind wants a result, it is seeking an end, a goal, which means it wants to be successful, only it does not call it that; it calls it the search for God, for truth, for understanding. But the intention, the background of that search, is the desire to be successful, the desire to be certain, the desire to be secure, to avoid all conflict, to reach a place where all disturbance will cease. When such a mind says, 'I am seeking', what it wants is to be enclosed permanently in the security of an ideal, which is its own projection.

So, the man who seeks will never find; but if we can understand the process of our own search, the whole psychological structure of our desire to find, to arrive, to succeed, which is quite complex, then we shall see that when seeking comes to an end there is the beginning of truth, the beginning of understanding. But there can be no understanding as long as the mind is in the process of grasping.

It is the very nature of the mind, is it not?, to acquire, to gain, to become; and in acquisition, in becoming, there is always agitation, con-

flict. Being in conflict, the mind seeks truth or God, and that search is merely avoidance, an escape from conflict. Escape is always the same, whether it is drink or God. So, a mind that is seeking can never find; but when the mind begins to understand its own process, then it is quiet, it is content. That contentment is not the outcome of acquiring or becoming something, it is not the contentment of satisfaction, of arriving at a position. Contentment which is free of all grasping comes only with the understanding of what is; but to understand what is, requires diligence, an awareness without rejection or acceptance. Only when the mind is not struggling, acquiring, grasping, can it be still, and only then is there understanding.

Question : To me, discipline is necessary to the good life; but you say that discipline is a hindrance to the good life. Please explain.

KRISHNAMURTI: We take for granted that discipline is essential to the good life. But is it? What do we mean by discipline? By discipline we mean conformity to a system, to an ideal, do we not? We are afraid to be what we are, so we discipline ourselves to be something else—which is a process of resistance, suppression, sublimation, substitution. Now, does conformity, resistance, suppression, lead to the good life? Are you good when you resist? Are you noble when you are afraid to see what you are and avoid it? Are you virtuous when you are conforming? The man who has enclosed himself in discipline—is he leading a noble life? Surely, he is merely resisting something of which he is afraid, conforming to a pattern that will assure him of security. Is that goodness? Or is goodness something beyond fear, beyond conformity and resistance?

It is easy merely to resist something, is it not? It is easy to comply, to conform, to imitate; but can such a mind ever be noble? After all, virtue is freedom, is it not? Discipline is a process of becoming virtuous; and surely, a mind that is *becoming* virtuous, is never virtuous. Virtue is freedom, and freedom comes through exploring and understanding the whole process of resistance, of conformity to social standards, that process by which the mind moves from the known to the known, and so is never in a state of insecurity. So, if we can understand the psychology of resistance, of conformity, of suppression, this whole process of becoming something which we call virtuous, if we can understand all that, only then is there a good life. A good life is a free life, a comprehending life, not a life of resisting, fighting, conforming. To be free, we have to understand the process of our own conditioning which has trained us either to resist or to conform.

So, a mind that is disciplined can never be free. A mind that is disciplined at the beginning, will not be free at the end; because, the beginning is the end. The end and the beginning are not two separate states, they are one continuous process; and if you say, 'I will be free through discipline', you are denying freedom at the very beginning. But if at the very beginning you go deeply into and understand the process of discipline, control, shaping, conforming, resisting, then you will see that freedom is now, not in the future.

Now, society makes use of discipline for its own purposes. A political party wants to have disciplined members for concerted action; but that action is never free, and therefore it creates resistance, the opposite, the other party; and so the two parties are in conflict with each other. But if we can understand the process which creates a party, whether of the left or of the right, the

process of discipline arising from our conditioning—if we can understand this in its entirety, then we shall see that the good life does not come about through discipline, but comes only through understanding one's desire to conform, to resist, to suppress, to imitate; and that understanding is virtue.

Question: You have said in one of your talks that the thought process must cease for reality to be. How can we know anything if thought ceases?

- KRISHNAMURTI: First, let us examine what we mean by thinking, and what we mean by experiencing, which is recognizing. As the questioner says, if thought ceases, how can it recognize anything? Now, what do we mean by thinking? Please do not wait for my answer—we are exploring it together. When we say, 'I am thinking', what do we mean? If I ask you that, you respond, do you not?—whether correctly or incorrectly is irrelevant for the time being. So, thinking is a process of response to challenge. The challenge is always new, but the response is always the old; so thinking is the response of memory, is it not? I ask you if you believe in God, and your immediate response is according to your memory or conditioning. Either you do or you do not believe. So, thinking is the process, the response of memory, which is habit. That is, memory is the result of experience, and experience is knowledge; and according to your memory, experience, knowledge, you respond to any challenge. The challenge is new, and your response is modified according to the newness, the vitality of the challenge; but it is always the response of the background, is it not?

So, thinking is the response of the background, of the past, of accumulated experience; it is the response

of memory at different levels, both individual and collective, particular and racial, conscious and unconscious. All that is our process of thinking. Therefore, our thinking can never be new. There can be no 'new' idea, because thinking can never renew itself; thinking can never be fresh, because it is always the response of the background—the background being our conditioning, our traditions, our experiences, our accumulations, collective and personal. So, when we look to thought as a means of discovering the new, we see the utter futility of it. Thought can only discover its own projection, it cannot discover anything new; thought can only recognize that which it has experienced, it cannot recognize that which it has not experienced.

Thought, then, is the process of recognition. Thought exists through verbalization, through symbols, through images, through words, otherwise there is no thought; therefore, thought can never be new, it can never be creative. When you say you are experiencing something, your experiencing is recognizing, is it not? If you did not recognize, you would not know you were experiencing. Now, can thought experience the new? Obviously not; because, thought can only recognize the old, that which it has known, that which it has experienced before. The new can never be experienced by thought, because thought is the reaction of the old.

This is not something metaphysical, complicated, or abstract. If you will look at it a little more closely, you will see that as long as the 'I'—the entity who is made up of all these memories—is experiencing, there can never be the discovery of the new. Thought, which is the 'I', can never experience God, because God or reality is the unknown, the unimaginable, the unformulated; it has no label, no word. The word 'God' is

not God. So, thought can never experience the new, the unknowable; it can only experience the known; for the mind can function only within the field of the known, it cannot function beyond it. The moment there is thought about the unknown, the mind is agitated; it is always seeking to bring the unknown into the known. But the unknown can never be brought into the known, and hence the conflict between the known and the unknown.

So, only when thought comes to an end is it possible for the unknown to be; and then there is no question of an 'I' experiencing the unknown. The 'I' can never experience the unknown, reality, God, or what you will. The 'I', the mind, the self, is the bundle of the known, which is memory; and memory can only recognize its own projections, it cannot recognize the unknown. That is why thought must come to an end.

Thought as the 'I' must cease to experience; there must be no feeling, no certainty, that 'I have experienced'. When thought, which is the response of memory, comes to an end, and the mind is no longer functioning in the field of the known, only then is it possible for the unknown to be.

The experiencing of the unknown is not possible; because, when you 'experience' the unknown, you are only experiencing the known as a new sensation. The unknown can never be recognized. The unknown is. But in that state the mind rebels, because it can only function within the field of the known.

That is why, for reality to be, you must understand the whole process of thinking, the process of the self. Thought can never discover or come to the unknown, the real; but when the mind is still, utterly silent—not made silent by any practice, by any discipline, by any system of control or meditation—, then, in that tranquillity, there is the reality which can

never be experienced by the mind, for reality is beyond all projections of the self.

July 23, 1950

III

TALK IN SEATTLE

We ought to be able, I think, to discern the difference between necessity and desire. Desire can never be integrated, because desire always creates contradiction, its own opposite; whereas, if we can understand necessity, then we shall see that in it there is no contradiction. And surely, it is important to be aware of this problem of desire, which creates contradiction in each one of us; because, desire can never at any time bring about integration, and it is only in the state of integration, in the state of wholeness, that there is a possibility of going beyond the contradictions created in the mind by desire. After all, desire is sensation, and sensation is the basis of thought, of the mind. Sensation is the foundation of all our thinking; and as long as we do not understand the process of desire, we are bound to create in our life the conflict of contradiction.

So, the understanding of desire is essential, and that understanding does not come through merely transferring desire from one level to another. Desire at any level, however high we may place it, is inevitably contradictory, and therefore destructive. But if we can understand necessity, then we shall see that desire is binding, that it does not bring about freedom; and to discern what is needful, is quite an arduous task, because desire constantly interferes with our needs. When we understand need, there is no contradiction; but to understand need, we must understand desire. And our problem is, is it not?, that there is a constant battle going on

between need and desire. Our whole social structure is based on this contradiction of desire. We think we are making progress when we move from one desire to what we call a higher desire; but desire, whether high or low, is always a contradiction, a source of conflict and great suffering.

So, if we can see how the whole process of desire works out in our daily life, then we shall understand the extraordinary importance of need, of necessity. Necessity is not a matter of choice, is it? When we can understand what is necessary, there is no contradiction, no battle either within or without; but to understand necessity, must we not examine the process of the mind that chooses what is necessary? The moment we bring in choice, does that not block the understanding of necessity? When we choose, do we ever discover what is necessary? Choice is always based, is it not?, on our conditioning; and that conditioning is the outcome of our contradictory desires. So, if we choose what is necessary, we are bound to create conflict, we are bound to bring about confusion. There is no thought without sensation; thought is the outcome of sensation, it is founded upon sensation; and if we can understand the ways of sensation, the ways of thought, and not choose what is necessary, then we shall see that necessity is a simple matter; and in that understanding there is no conflict, no contradiction.

Where there is desire, there is conflict and contradiction; and whether we are aware of it or not, contradiction invariably brings pain. So, desire is sorrow, whether we desire trivial things or great things. Desire inevitably brings its own opposite in its wake; and therefore, it is important, is it not?, to understand the whole process of thought, which is the 'me' and the 'mine'. The understanding of desire is the way of self-knowledge. Without understand-

ing the self, there is no possibility of understanding what is essential, necessary in life. Self-knowledge comes only through the understanding of relationship, which is the beginning of wisdom. Wisdom cannot be bought, it cannot be gathered ; it arises from moment to moment in relationship when the mind is aware, clear, and observing, without choice.

So, if we would understand the contradiction in which most of us live, there must be self-knowledge, which is the understanding of desire ; and without understanding the whole process of desire, merely to follow one particular desire does not solve our problem. What solves our problem is to understand the nature of contradiction, which is desire. Desire can never be overcome ; but when we see the truth that desire always creates its own opposite and therefore is a contradiction, then desire comes to an end ; and only then is there a possibility of being content with necessity.

In considering these questions, it is important to find out in what way we are approaching them. If we come to a problem with a pre-conception, with a conclusion, with an opinion, obviously we cannot understand that problem. As I said, any problem is always new, fresh ; and a mind that comes to a problem with a conclusion, with accumulated knowledge, cannot understand it. The mind can understand only when it comes to the problem afresh ; and if we can, this morning, let us examine each question directly and see the truth of it ; for it is the discovery of the truth of the problem that liberates us from the problem itself.

Question : How many centuries will it take for the few who understand to bring about a fundamental transformation in the world ?

KRISHNAMURTI : It is important to find out, is it not ?, from what point

of view this question is put. If we say it will take many centuries to bring about a fundamental transformation because there are very few individuals who really desire to transform themselves, we are obviously concerned with the problem of time. That is, we want immediate transformation because we see in the world such confusion, misery, conflict, starvation, economic problems, and wars ; we see this unceasing sorrow, and so we are impatient, we desire transformation within a certain period of time. We say, 'The transformation of a few individuals will not bring about a fundamental and rapid change in the structure of society. Therefore, the transformation of the few is not very important. Though it is necessary, there must be a quicker way to bring about a fundamental revolution'.

Now, is there a rapid, an immediate way to transform man ? And if we bring about a rapid change, will that be enduring ? The world cannot be changed immediately. Even revolution cannot bring about an immediate and universal change ; the millions cannot be fed overnight. But it is important, is it not ?, to find out whether you and I can change, can bring about a fundamental transformation in ourselves, irrespective of its utilitarian aspect. And is the discovery and understanding of truth, useful ? Has truth any use ? Is it utilitarian ? That is really what is implied in this question : whether truth is useful. Truth has no use whatever, has it ? It cannot be used. It is. And the moment we approach truth with the desire to use it in the world of action, we destroy it. But if we can see the truth and allow it to operate without wanting to use it, then it brings about a fundamental transformation in our thinking, in our relationship. So, as long as we regard truth as a thing to be used, as a means of transforming society or ourselves, it becomes merely an instrument—it is not an end in itself,

without causation. But if it is an end in itself, without any utilitarian purpose, that is, if we allow it to operate within us, and without any interference from the mind, then unknowingly, unconsciously, it has a far-reaching effect.

So, what is important is not whether the few can bring about a fundamental change—even though fundamental changes generally are brought about by the few—but to find out whether one is oneself really in earnest to discover this extraordinary liberating factor, this thing that we call truth or God, irrespective of any social or other value it may have. Because, the mind is always seeking values, is it not? And if it seeks truth as a 'value', then that value is recognizable; but truth is not recognizable, it has no 'value' for the mind. The mind cannot use it. But if the mind is quiet, then truth will operate; and this operation is extensive, unlimited, and therein lies freedom and happiness.

Question : Religions advocate prayer, and for centuries man has found in it his consolation. This concerted effort through the centuries is surely a significant and vital force. Do you deny its importance?

KRISHNAMURTI : What is the function of prayer? Has prayer any significance? And what do we mean by prayer? Let us go into the whole question without any bias or prejudice. Obviously, man through the centuries has prayed; and it must bring results, it must in some way give him consolation, satisfaction, an answer in accordance with his demand, otherwise he would not continue to pray. Now, when do we pray? Surely, we pray when we are in trouble, do we not? We pray when we are in a state of uncertainty, of contradiction, that is, when we are unhappy. We do not pray when we are happy, when we see things very

clearly, simply, and directly, but only when we are confused. So, prayer is a form of petition, of supplication, is it not? And when we ask, we receive; and we receive according to our demand. When we pray, surely we are always asking for satisfaction in one form or another. One may pray for light, or guidance, another for the removal of pain, and so on; but the desire, the intention, is always to find peace, gratification. A mind that is seeking gratification at whatever level, high or low, is bound to be gratified, is it not? That is why, when we are confused, when we are in pain, when we are in uncertainty, we turn to prayer. Through prayer we hope to receive certainty, reassurance, the right answer to our problem. Please, I am not for or against prayer. We are examining the problem. I think there is a much greater thing than prayer; and we can discover that only when we understand the ways of prayer, this whole problem of supplication.

So, what happens when we pray? I am sure many of us have prayed. What is the way of prayer? We take a certain posture, repeat certain words or phrases, and gradually, through this repetition, the mind becomes quiet. The mind is made quiet by repetition of certain phrases, and in that quietness you receive an answer to your problem. But the answer is invariably gratifying, otherwise you would not accept it; though the answer may be painful, yet in the very acceptance of that painful answer there is gratification. That is, through the constant repetition of certain phrases, or the prolonged dwelling on certain ideas, the mind is made quiet; and when the mind is quiet, it is capable of receiving an answer. But the answer depends on the petitioner; and the answer he receives is from the concentrated accumulation of innumerable desires, conscious and unconscious longings, and collective effort, of many people through many

centuries. You can test this out for yourself. When you consciously ask for something in prayer, there is an unconscious response; and that response is from the accumulated and concentrated effort of centuries, modified according to the particular conditioning of the petitioner. But prayer does not ultimately help the individual to understand himself; and it is only in understanding oneself fundamentally, as a total process, that there is a possibility of going beyond the state of demanding, seeking, of striving to achieve a result. As I said, there is something far more important than prayer, which is meditation; and we shall discuss that at another time.

Now, it is important, is it not?, to understand this problem of prayer in relation to conflict, pain and suffering. Because, we never pray when we are happy, when we are joyous, when we have no problems; we pray only when we are in conflict, when we have a difficulty which we cannot solve. There are two different kinds of prayer, which are essentially the same. There is the prayer of active supplication, petition, and there is the prayer in which we simply remain open, but are unconsciously waiting to receive something. When we pray, we always have an outstretched hand, we are waiting, hoping, longing for an answer, for some consolation; and in that petitioning, we will find an answer according to our struggles, according to our conditioning. But prayer will never release the mind from creating the very problems that cause us to pray. What will free the mind from manufacturing its own problems is the understanding of itself; and the understanding of itself is self-knowledge. But the whole process of knowing oneself is so complex that few of us are desirous of going into the problem; we would rather find a superficial answer, and so we turn to prayer. For centuries man has built up a concentrated reservoir, a store-

house of thought and desire, from which prayer may evoke an answer, a consolation; but that response is not the solution of the problem. The solution of the problem is to understand the total process of the mind itself.

Question: At various times in our lives, we have some kind of mystical experience. How do we know that these are not illusions? How can we recognize reality?

KRISHNAMURTI: What do we mean by illusion? What creates illusion? Surely, illusion is created, is it not?, when the mind is caught up in desire. As long as the mind interprets what is perceived according to its longings, wishes, and desires, according to its likes and dislikes, there must be illusion. As long as the mind does not understand desire, it translates experience and inevitably creates illusion. That is, if I have an experience which is called 'mystical' and do not understand the process of my own mind, that experience is bound to create illusion. And if I am attached to any particular form of experience, if I wish to gather more of it and continue in it, there must also be illusion; because, I am concerned, not with perceiving what is, but with gaining, guarding, accumulating.

Most of us have had some kind of mystical experience which has brought a certain clarity, a certain release, a certain happiness; and when it has passed, the memory of it becomes very important to us. We cling to the memory of that experience, and the very fact that we cling to it indicates that we are caught in illusion. Memory is within the field of time, and what is true is beyond time; and when the mind holds to any particular experience, that experience becomes mere sensation, and sensation makes for illusions. So, when we cling to the memory of any so-called 'mystical experience' which

we may have had, it indicates that we are concerned with the sensation that the experience has left behind, and therefore there is illusion. We cannot ever cling to the experience itself; we can never hold on to the state of experiencing. We can only accumulate memory, with its sensations; and when we do, we create a hindrance to further experiencing. Clinging to the past prevents the new, and so this attachment to the memory of a particular experience creates illusion.

The next part of this question is, "How can we recognize reality?" To go into that, we must understand the process of experiencing. We experience only when we recognize, do we not? If I meet you and recognize you, I have an experience; but if I do not recognize you, there is no experience. So, where there is recognition, there is the process of experiencing. Now, how do I recognize? Recognition is based on memory, is it not? And can memory, which is the residue of the past, ever recognize the new? Please, as this is an important question, let us go into it a little carefully.

Most of us move from the known to the known; our mind functions within the field of the known, and it cannot function outside. Now, can such a mind recognize what is true? Can it recognize the unknown? Can it recognize God? If God is the unknown, how can we recognize it? We can only recognize something which we have experienced, which we have known before; and when we recognize something, is it the truth, is it the new? As long as there is the old, the new cannot be; only when the old ceases is there a possibility of the new. And when we ask, "How can we recognize reality?", we want to know whether the 'I', the accumulated past, the known, can give a name to the new. When we give a name to the new, has not the new ceased to be? So, God is not a thing to be recognized; truth

is not something to be known through memory. It is only when the mind is entirely and absolutely still that the new can be—which is not a process of recognition. On the contrary, when the mind is translating the new in terms of the old, it is not still, and so truth cannot be. The mind cannot translate the new in terms of the old—it can only translate what is supposed to be the new in terms of what it has known.

So, the important thing is not whether you and I can recognize truth, but how to free the mind from desire so that it can be completely still. Stillness of the mind does not come about through any discipline. The mind cannot be made still by any compulsion, with any motive, or for any purpose; but it is spontaneously still when it understands its own conflicting desires which create problems. The mind is still, only when it knows itself as a totality; but as long as it does not know itself completely, it goes on creating problems and can never be still. So, the mind must understand the ways of itself, and for that it must be alertly passive, aware without choice; and only then is there a possibility that the mind can be completely and totally still. We can make the mind superficially still through prayer, through various psychological tricks, but such a mind is not fundamentally still. Stillness comes only when there is complete understanding of the whole process of recognition, demanding, and responding, which is the process of the self; and that is an arduous task.

Question : Will you please explain what you mean by creativeness?

KRISHNAMURTI: Is creativeness a matter of capacity? / Creativeness mastery of a technique? / Creativeness a gift? /

One can m
through constant

the accumulation of knowledge and experience, both one's own and that of another. But does the perfection of a technique make for creativeness? You may practise the piano for hours and be able to play expertly, your technique may be perfect; but will that make you a creative musician? If you know how to write poetry, if you can make a perfect garland of words, are you thereby a poet? Will technique bring about that freedom in which the 'me', the self, is absent? It is only when the self, the 'me', is absent, that there is creativeness; otherwise, technique merely emphasizes or distracts the self, modifying or enlarging it—and surely, that does not bring about creativeness.

As long as the mind is in conflict with what it has produced, is producing, or will produce, there cannot be a creative state, can there? Can there ever be creativeness as long as we are in conflict? Surely, conflict excludes every form of creative action; and creativity comes into being only when the mind is still, not in a state of conflict. As long as the mind is caught between thesis and antithesis, between the opposites, how can there be that state of alert passivity which alone is creative? We think that through conflict, through battle, through probing, analyzing, we shall have a peaceful state; but is there ever a peaceful state through conflict? Is not that peaceful state independent of conflict? As long as there is the desire to achieve a result, the desire to be creative, obviously we must be in a state of conflict; and such a state denies creativeness.

So, how is one to have that creative state? How is it possible to achieve creativeness? It is not possible to achieve creativeness. All that we can do is to understand conflict, which denies creativeness; and the understanding of conflict is the understanding of oneself. You see, we think that to have a technique, to be able

to draw, to write a poem or an article, to fulfil oneself in one form or another, is to be creative. But surely, that is not creativeness; that is merely self-expression, satisfying a certain appetite through technique. But if we can understand this whole process of conflict, this striving after attainment which brings in our lives such contradiction, such sorrow and pain, then we shall see that the mind becomes very quiet, without any striving; and when the mind is silent, free of the anxieties and demands of the self, only then is there a possibility for creative being. That creativeness may or may not express itself in words, in marble, in thought; or it may be utterly silent. But we want expression. To most of us, creativeness is a process of expression, it is the power to do something; and we consider that power of expression as far more important than to be free. We crave for expression because it gives us a sense of fulfilment, a sense of importance; it gives us the feeling of being somebody, of being socially useful. All this feeds our vanity in many ways, and so destroys the state of creativeness.

Actually, creativeness may not express itself at all, because the state of creativeness is silent. To seek expression is to deny creativeness, because that which is creative can never be cumulative. Creativeness is only from moment to moment, it is not a state of continuity. The moment it is a continuous state, it is within the field of time, and that which is within the field of time is not creative. Creativeness is timeless; but we would like to hold it within the field of time in order to be able to express it. As long as the mind is seeking to be creative, creativeness can never be, because all the efforts of the mind are within the field of time. Only when the mind is utterly still, silent with a silence that is not induced, is there

a possibility of the timeless, the creative. So, what is important is not to verbalize about this creative state, but to understand the whole process of conflict in the mind. And as the pool is quiet when the winds stop, so there is creativeness when the problems which the mind creates come to an end.

July 30, 1950

IV

TALK IN SEATTLE

Most of us seek some kind of result, and we never think of action without result. We do not have the sense of moving, acting, unless there is an end in view. As long as we seek a result, the result is psychologically much more important to us than the means; and the corruption of the means is inevitable when we give a greater significance to the result. Action then is guided by the desire for a result, rather than by consideration of the means—and action is thereby stultified. That is, as long as there is the psychological seeking of a result from action, we stultify that action, because we are chiefly concerned with the result, and only incidentally with the action. Therefore, as we see throughout the world at the present time, action breeds further confusion, further misery. This outward conflict and suffering can be brought to an end only when we see how the mind is constantly seeking a result in action, that is, security for itself, and is therefore not concerned with the means of action. The means and the end are not two different states, they are a unitary process. The means is the end; and if we understand the means, the right end is inevitable. But as I said, most of us are not concerned with the means. We are mostly concerned with the end; and hoping for a right end, we use wrong methods. But the method produces

the result, and if we want peace, we must use peaceful means. Therefore, the means is much more important than the end.

Now, the understanding of the means without searching for an end, is a fundamental and necessary revolution in our whole approach to life. Because, thought invariably seeks a reward, in each one of us there is a psychological demand for gratification; and the result is that all action, whether political, economic, or social, leads to endless controversy and ultimately to violence. There is no clarity of perception because fundamentally we are not concerned with the means, but only with the result, with the goal, with the end; and we do not see that the end and the means are not separate, that they are one. The end is in the means, and if psychologically we seek a result independent of the means, physical action must inevitably produce confusion. That is, when we use the result as a means of inward or psychological security, our working for that result has a conditioning effect on the mind; and this process can be understood fully only when we see the significance of action.

At present, we know 'action' only in terms of achieving a result, a goal. We work towards a goal, in the psychological as well as the physical sense. To us, action is a process of achieving something, not of understanding action itself—which alone will produce the right means, and hence the right end, without the search for a result; and the understanding of action is surely the understanding of the whole process of our thinking. That is why it is so essential to have complete understanding of the total process of one's consciousness—the ways of one's own thought feeling and action. Without understanding oneself, merely to achieve a result will only lead to further confusion, misery, and frustration.

To understand the whole process of oneself requires constant alertness,

awareness in the action of relationship. There must be a constant watching of every incident, without choice, without condemnation or acceptance, with a certain sense of dispassion, so that the truth of every incident is revealed. But this self-knowledge is not a result, an end. There is no end to self-knowledge ; it is a constant process of understanding which comes about only when one begins objectively and goes deeper and deeper into the whole problem of daily living, which is the 'you' and the 'me' in relationship.

I have several questions, and in considering them, do not let us seek an answer ; because, merely to find an answer is to put an end to further discovery and understanding. But if we can follow the problem as it is revealed step by step, then perhaps we shall be able to see the truth of it ; and it is the truth of the problem that will free us from the problem itself.

Question : Though you tell us it is necessary for the mind to become still if we are to experience reality, yet you do everything in your power to stimulate us to think.

KRISHNAMURTI : Am I stimulating you to think ? If it is mere stimulation, then weariness will come out of it ; because, every form of stimulation soon comes to an end, leaving the mind dull, unelastic, and weary. If these talks and discussions have become merely a means of stimulation, then I am afraid you will find, when they are over, that you will fall back into your dreary ruts, your old beliefs, your insensitive attitudes and ways of thinking. But if, instead of being a stimulation, they are a process in which you and I examine facts and see them exactly as they are—which is the beginning of the perception of what is true—, then these talks and discussions will obviously have been worth while. Surely, it is edifying to see things as they are—

for, then it will bring about a fundamental transformation. Therefore, we are not seeking stimulation, but are exploring together all our human problems. Stimulation makes you think along a particular line, it is a process of substitution, which conditions you in a new direction ; whereas, only when we are trying to see things as they are, very clearly, without bias, without distortion, is it possible for the mind to be quiet. The mind cannot be quiet, cannot be calm or still, when there is any distortion, when it is capable of creating illusion. And as the mind is infinitely capable of creating illusion, to be aware of the power to create illusion, which is to be aware of desire, is surely not stimulation. On the contrary, there is freedom from stimulation only when there is awareness of how the mind works, how it manipulates, connives, distorts ; and that freedom alone can bring about tranquillity of mind.

Now, the mind can enclose itself in a particular belief or illusion, and thereby think it is tranquil ; but such a mind is obviously not tranquil—it is dead, unpliant, insensitive. The mind is tranquil only when it is infinitely pliable, capable of adjusting, of seeing things as they are ; and it is only when the mind is capable of seeing things as they are that there is freedom from that which it has seen. Surely, we must go through all this process of uncovering, exploring, before the mind can be still. Without tranquillity of the mind, obviously there can be no true perception ; and to discover what are the distorting factors, the distractions which the mind has cultivated, is not a stimulation. If it is a stimulation, the mind will never be tranquil, because it will go from one stimulation to another ; and a mind that seeks stimulation is a dull, an insufficient mind, incapable of perceiving anything but its own sensations.

So, what is important is not to depend on any stimulation, either of a

ritual, of an idea, or of drink. All stimulations are on the same level, for stimulation of any kind makes the mind dull and weary; but to see the fact that the mind depends upon stimulation, is to be free of that fact. Perceiving things without distortion brings about the tranquillity of mind which is so essential for reality to be.

Question : I worry a great deal. Can you tell me how I can be free from worry ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Why do you want to be free from worry? You mean you want to be free from a particular worry, from a certain kind of disturbance, but you do not want to be free from all worry, do you? Most of us want to be occupied, and we only know we exist because we are occupied. We say that occupation is necessary for the mind—whether it is occupation with God, with self-fulfilment, with a car, with a family, with success, with virtue, or what you will. Surely, the mind demands to be occupied, otherwise we would be lost; and this very occupation is worry, is it not? What would happen if you did not worry, if the mind were not occupied with something? Would you not feel utterly lost? If you have no occupation, you will find one. If you do not worry about society, you will worry about God, and be occupied with that; or you will worry about the war, about the newspapers, the radio, about what people say or do not say. The mind is constantly occupied, its very existence depends on its occupation. So, for most of us, occupation, which is a form of worry, is essential. If we did not worry, if we were not occupied, we would feel utterly at a loss, we would say there is nothing to do, that life is vain, empty; so, the mind occupies itself and keeps worrying.

For most of us, occupation is an escape from our own essential insufficiency. Being insufficient, we worry

over something as a means of escape from that which is. So, the question is not how to be free from a particular worry, but to understand the whole problem of occupation—which involves right means of livelihood in one direction, and the psychological occupation of the mind in another. Most of us find that the mind cannot be without thought, without occupation, without worry. Most of us are afraid to be what we are—beautiful or ugly, intelligent or stupid, or whatever it may be—and proceed from there. The mind is afraid to be what it is, and so it seeks an escape, the higher-sounding, the better. This escape from what is may be called reality or God, but it is merely a self-enclosing isolation; and the more isolated one is, the more one worries, the more one must be occupied.

Surely, then, freedom from worry is not the problem. The problem is to find out why the mind demands occupation; and if we go into it rather carefully, we will discover that the mind is afraid of being as nothing. Surely, a cup is useful only when it is empty; and the mind is creative only when it is capable of emptying itself, being purged of its whole content. It is only when the mind is empty, silent, that it is creative. But to come to that point, one must understand the total process of the mind, how it is constantly occupied, worrying about a virtue, about death, about success. At however high a level, worry is still worry; and a worrying, agitated mind can never understand any problem. It can only go around in circles, hoping to find a way out—and that is what it does. A mind that is constantly occupied is seeking a result, an end, a goal; and to such a mind, the means is not important at all.

So, the important thing is not how to free oneself from worry, but to find out why the mind is so occupied, so desirous of holding on to and identifying itself with a particular idea, belief, or concept. Surely, it does this be-

cause of its own insufficiency. Without understanding its own insufficiency, without going into it deeply, the mind tries to run away from it through occupation; and the more you run, the more you worry. The only way out of this process is to come back and look at insufficiency.

Question : I love my son. He may be killed in the war. What am I to do ?

KRISHNAMURTI : I wonder if you do love your son ? If you really loved your son, would there be war ? Would you not prevent war in any form if you really loved your son ? Would you not bring about right education—an education which would not be identified with either the Orient or the Occident ? If you really loved your son, would you not see to it that no belief divided human beings, that no national frontier stood between man and man ?

I am afraid we do not love our children. "I love my son" is merely the accepted phrase. If we loved our sons, there would be a fundamental revolution in education, would there not ? Because, at the present time, we are merely cultivating technique, efficiency ; and the higher the efficiency, the greater the ruthlessness. The more nationalistic and separative we are, the faster society disintegrates. We are torn apart by our belief, by our ideologies, by our religions and dogmas ; and inevitably there is conflict, not only between different societies, but between groups in the same society.

So, although we may say that we love our children, we are obviously not deeply concerned about them as long as we are nationalistic, as long as we cling to our property, as long as we are bound, conditioned by our religious beliefs. These are the disintegrating factors in society, leading inevitably to war and utter misery ; and if we are really desirous of sav-

ing the children, it is for us as individuals to bring about a fundamental transformation in ourselves. This means, does it not ? that we have to revalue the whole structure of society. That is a very complex and arduous business, and so we leave it to the experts—religious, economic, and political. But the expert cannot understand that which is beyond his particular specialization. The specialist is never an integrated person ; and integration is the only solution to our problem. There must be a total integration of ourselves as individuals, and only then can we educate the child to be an integrated human being ; and there obviously cannot be integration as long as there are racial, national, political, and religious prejudices. Until we alter all that in ourselves fundamentally, we are bound to have war—and whatever you may say about loving your son is not going to stop it. What will stop war is the profound realization that one must oneself be free of those disintegrating factors which create war. It is only then that we will put an end to war. But unfortunately, most of us are not interested in all this. We want an immediate result, an immediate answer.

War, after all, is the spectacular and bloody projection of our daily lives ; and without altering the fundamental structure of our own existence, we hope that by some miracle, wars will come to an end. Or, we blame some other society, we say some other national group is responsible for wars. It is our responsibility, not that of someone else, and those who are really serious about this thing, who are not seeking an easy explanation, will know how to act, taking into consideration this whole structure of the causation of war.

So, if we do love our children, then the structure of society will be fundamentally altered ; and the more we love, the deeper will be our influence on society. Therefore, it is important to understand the whole process

of oneself; and no expert, no general, no teacher, can give us the key to that understanding. Self-knowledge is the outcome of our own intensity, our own clarity, our own awareness in relationship; and relationship is not only with people but also with property and with ideas.

Question : How am I to overcome loneliness ?

KRISHNAMURTI : Can you overcome loneliness ? Whatever you conquer has to be conquered again and again, does it not ? What you understand comes to an end, but that which you conquer can never come to an end. The battling process only feeds and strengthens that with which you fight.

Now, what is this loneliness of which most of us are aware ? We know it, and we run away from it, do we not ? We take flight from it into every form of activity. We are empty, lonely, and we are afraid of it ; so, we try to cover it up by some means or other—meditation, the search for God, social activity, the radio, drink, or what you will—we would do anything else rather than face it, be with it, understand it. Running away is the same, whether we do it through the idea of God, or through drink. As long as one is escaping from loneliness, there is no essential difference between the worship of God and addiction to alcohol. Socially there may be a difference ; but psychologically, the man who runs away from himself, from his own emptiness, whose escape is his search for God, is on the same level with the drunkard.

What is important, then, is not to overcome loneliness, but to understand it ; and we cannot understand it if we do not face it, if we do not look at it directly, if we are continually running away from it. And our whole life is a process of running

away from loneliness, is it not ? In relationship, we use others to cover up loneliness ; our pursuit of knowledge, our gathering of experience, everything we do, is a distraction, an escape from that emptiness. So, these distractions and escapes must obviously come to an end. If we are to understand something, we must give our full attention to it, must we not ? And how can we give full attention to loneliness if we are afraid of it, if we are running away from it through some distraction ? So, when we really want to understand loneliness, when our intention is to go fully, completely into it, because we see that there can be no creativeness as long as we do not understand that inward insufficiency which is the fundamental cause of fear—when we come to that point, then every form of distraction ends, does it not ? Many people laugh at loneliness and say, ‘Oh, that is only for the bourgeois ; for God’s sake, he occupied with something and forgot it’. But emptiness cannot be forgotten, it cannot be put aside.

So, if one would really understand this fundamental thing which we call loneliness, all escape must cease ; but escape does not cease through worry, through seeking a result, or through any action of desire. One must see that, without understanding loneliness, every form of action is a distraction, an escape, a process of self-isolation, which only creates more conflict, more misery. To see that fact, is essential, for only then can one face loneliness.

Then, if we go still more deeply into it, the problem arises of whether that which we call loneliness is an actuality, or merely a word. Is loneliness an actuality, or merely a word which covers something that may not be what we think it is ? Is not loneliness a thought, the result of thinking ? That is, thinking is verbalization based on memory ; and do we not, with that verbalization,

with that thought, with that memory, look at the state which we call 'lonely'? So, the very giving of a name to that state may be the cause of the fear which prevents us from looking at it more closely; and if we do not give it a name, which is fabricated by the mind, then is that state lonely?

Surely, there is a difference between loneliness and being alone. Loneliness is the ultimate in the process of self-isolation. The more you are conscious of yourself, the more isolated you are; and self-consciousness is the process of isolation. But aloneness is not isolation. There is aloneness only when loneliness has come to an end. Aloneness is a state in which all influence has completely ceased, both the influence from outside, and the inner influence of memory; and only when the mind is in that state of aloneness can it know the incorruptible. But to come to that, we must understand loneliness, this process of isolation, which is the self and its activity. So, the understanding of the self is the beginning of the cessation of isolation, and therefore of loneliness.

Question : Is there continuity after death ?

KRISHNAMURTI : In this question several things are implied. There is the idea of immortality, which we think is continuity, the question of what we mean by death, and whether there is a spiritual essence in each one of us that will continue in spite of death. So, let us examine this question, however briefly.

You ask if there is continuity after death. Now, what do we mean by 'continuity'? Continuity obviously implies cause and effect: a series of incidents or causes, which are remembered, and which continue. Please, if I may suggest, let us listen very carefully and think it out together, and perhaps we shall see

something much greater than the mere desire to continue after death.

Most of us want to continue. To us, life is a series of incidents tied together by memory. We have experiences which are continually accumulating, as the memories of childhood, of pleasant things; and the unpleasant memories are also there, although hidden. This whole process of cause and effect gives a sense of continuity which is the 'me'. The 'me', the self, is a chain of remembered incidents—whether they are pleasant or unpleasant is not important. My house, my family, my experience, my cultivation of virtue, and so on—all that is the 'me'; and you want to know if that 'me' continues after death.

Now, it is obvious that some kind of thought-continuity must exist; but we are not satisfied with that, are we? We want immortality, and we say that this process of continuity will eventually lead us to immortality. But will continuity ever lead us to immortality? What is it that continues? It is memory, is it not? It is a bundle of memories moving from the past through the present to the future. And can that which continues ever be free from the net of time?

Surely, only that which comes to an end, can renew—not that which has continuity. That which has continuity can only continue in its own state; it can be modified, altered, but it is essentially the same all along. Only for that which comes to an end is there a possibility of fundamental transformation. So, immortality is not continuity. Immortality is that state in which time, as continuity of the 'me', has ceased.

Is there a spiritual essence in each one of us that will continue? What is spiritual essence? If there is a spiritual essence, it must obviously be beyond the field of time, beyond causation; and if the mind can think about it, or if it has already conceived it, it is obviously the product

portant to understand the whole process of oneself. The ways of the self can be discovered only in relationship to things, to people, and to ideas; and in the mirror of that relationship we begin to see ourselves as we are. But to understand the process of oneself, there can be no condemnation or justification of one's own reactions. Our difficulty is, is it not ?, that most of us are continually seeking subtle forms of isolation. Because we have conflict in our relationships, we gradually withdraw, inwardly as well as outwardly, into isolation; and without understanding relationship at all levels, not only with people, but also with ideas and things, it is impossible to go deeply into the problem of reality.

Reality is not something abstract or theoretical, it has nothing to do with philosophy; reality is in the understanding of relationship, in being aware at every moment of our speech, of our conduct, of the way we treat people, the way we consider others; for behaviour is righteousness, and in that there is reality. Without understanding relationship, it is impossible to go beyond conflict. To go beyond conflict without that understanding is merely a means of escape; and where there is escape, there is the power to create illusion. Most of us have that power to create illusion extraordinarily developed, because we have not understood relationship. It is only in the understanding of relationship, which is to comprehend the total process of oneself fundamentally and deeply, that there is freedom; and only in freedom can there be the discovery of what is real.

The mind can never find reality by searching for it. All that the mind can do is to be quiet, to be tranquil, and then reality comes into being. Reality must come to us; we cannot go after reality. If you seek God, you will never find God, because your search is merely a desire to escape from the realities of life. Without understanding the realities of life,

every conflict, every movement of thought, the inward workings of the mind, both subtle and obvious, the hidden as well as the open—without understanding all that, merely to seek reality is only an evasion; and the mind is infinitely capable of producing illusory concepts of reality. So, as long as the mind is not understood, as long as the whole process of the self, of the 'me', which is the centre of acquisitiveness, is not fully comprehended, there can be no cessation of conflict, and therefore no happiness, no virtue.

Virtue is not an end. Virtue brings freedom; therefore, virtue is essential. Virtue, which is freedom, lies in the understanding of conduct, of our relationship to things, to nature, to people, and to ideas. Surely, then, it is important to know our own thinking and feeling, to be aware of all our actions without any sense of condemnation or justification. To see in the mirror of our relationship exactly what is taking place, there must be choiceless awareness; and in the very perception of what is, there is freedom from what is. But to perceive clearly, exactly, what is taking place is most difficult and arduous; because, we have so many prejudices, so many subtle forms of condemnation and justification, and these prevent fundamental understanding. It is these subtle conditionings of the mind that hinder the further understanding of relationship, of the complex problem of life; and without that understanding, however earnest one may be in search of what is called reality, such a search inevitably becomes an evasion, an escape. In escape there are all kinds of illusions, all kinds of myths; and the more we acquire and cling to these myths, the greater will be the difficulty of liberation.

So, what is important is to understand the whole process of the self, of the 'me'; for without that understanding, there is no possibility of a new and fundamental action. If one would understand society and bring

of thought, and so within the field of time ; and therefore it is not a spiritual essence. We like to think that there is a spiritual essence, but it is merely an idea, the product of thought, of our conditioning. When the mind clings to the idea of a spiritual essence, it indicates, does it not ?, that we are seeking security, certainty ; and it is the perpetuation of comfort, of security, that we call immortality. As long as the mind continues in the sense of moving from the known to the known, there is always the fear of death.

Now, surely, there is another way of living, which is to die each day to the things of yesterday, and not to carry over to tomorrow the things of today. If in living we can die to the things the mind clings to, then in that very dying we shall find that there is a life which is not of memory, which is not of time. To die in that sense is to understand this whole process of accumulation, which creates the fear of losing, which is the cause of the desire to immortalize the 'me' through family, through property, or through continuity in the hereafter. If we can be aware of how the mind is constantly seeking certainty, a state in which there can never be freedom ; if we can cease to accumulate inwardly and not be psychologically concerned about the morrow, which means coming to an end each day—if we can do this, then there is immortality, that state in which time is not.

August 6, 1950

V

TALK IN SEATTLE

Most of us are very easily satisfied with explanations, theories and words, and our superficial interest will obviously never bring about a fundamental revolution. What is neces-

sary, surely, at the present time and at all times, is to have a radical transformation in oneself ; and this transformation affects not only our personal relationships, but also our relationship to society. Without this deep inner revolution, there can be no lasting happiness, no final solution to any of our problems. It is almost impossible for those who are only superficially interested to go into these matters deeply and understand the whole process of themselves ; and only those who are really in earnest can bring about this revolution. This inner revolution is not the search for new explanations, new words, new slogans ; it comes only with the freedom from all sense of acquisitiveness.

Now, we are not only acquisitive on the physical plane, where we have built our whole social structure on acquisitiveness, but also in our relationships. That is, in our relationship with one another there is a sense of possessiveness, which is merely an outward indication of deep frustration, loneliness, and so on. We are acquisitive also in the matter of knowledge. We think that acquiring more and more knowledge, more and more explanations, wider and wider information, will in some miraculous way solve our problems. Acquisitiveness at any level only binds the mind, shapes it according to a particular pattern ; and a pattern can obviously never produce revolution. Any form of acquisitiveness—whether in the pursuit of worldly things, in relationship, in learning, in experience, or in the desire to find reality—will always create conflict, will always bring about misunderstanding, a series of battles, inward as well as outward. And where there is conflict, there can obviously be no understanding.

It is acquisitiveness that prevents us from living clearly, simply, and directly ; and until there is a fundamental revolution in each one, obviously no real social improvement is possible. That is why it is so im-

portant to understand the whole process of oneself. The ways of the self can be discovered only in relationship to things, to people, and to ideas; and in the mirror of that relationship we begin to see ourselves as we are. But to understand the process of oneself, there can be no condemnation or justification of one's own reactions. Our difficulty is, is it not ?, that most of us are continually seeking subtle forms of isolation. Because we have conflict in our relationships, we gradually withdraw, inwardly as well as outwardly, into isolation; and without understanding relationship at all levels, not only with people, but also with ideas and things, it is impossible to go deeply into the problem of reality.

Reality is not something abstract or theoretical, it has nothing to do with philosophy; reality is in the understanding of relationship, in being aware at every moment of our speech, of our conduct, of the way we treat people, the way we consider others; for behaviour is righteousness, and in that there is reality. Without understanding relationship, it is impossible to go beyond conflict. To go beyond conflict without that understanding is merely a means of escape; and where there is escape, there is the power to create illusion. Most of us have that power to create illusion extraordinarily developed, because we have not understood relationship. It is only in the understanding of relationship, which is to comprehend the total process of oneself fundamentally and deeply, that there is freedom; and only in freedom can there be the discovery of what is real.

The mind can never find reality by searching for it. All that the mind can do is to be quiet, to be tranquil, and then reality comes into being. Reality must come to us; we cannot go after reality. If you seek God, you will never find God, because your search is merely a desire to escape from the realities of life. Without understanding the realities of life,

every conflict, every movement of thought, the inward workings of the mind, both subtle and obvious, the hidden as well as the open—without understanding all that, merely to seek reality is only an evasion; and the mind is infinitely capable of producing illusory concepts of reality. So, as long as the mind is not understood, as long as the whole process of the self, of the 'me', which is the centre of aquisitiveness, is not fully comprehended, there can be no cessation of conflict, and therefore no happiness, no virtue.

Virtue is not an end. Virtue brings freedom; therefore, virtue is essential. Virtue, which is freedom, lies in the understanding of conduct, of our relationship to things, to nature, to people, and to ideas. Surely, then, it is important to know our own thinking and feeling, to be aware of all our actions without any sense of condemnation or justification. To see in the mirror of our relationship exactly what is taking place, there must be choiceless awareness; and in the very perception of what is, there is freedom from what is. But to perceive clearly, exactly, what is taking place is most difficult and arduous; because, we have so many prejudices, so many subtle forms of condemnation and justification, and these prevent fundamental understanding. It is these subtle conditionings of the mind that hinder the further understanding of relationship, of the complex problem of life; and without that understanding, however earnest one may be in search of what is called reality, such a search inevitably becomes an evasion, an escape. In escape there are all kinds of illusions, all kinds of myths; and the more we acquire and cling to these myths, the greater will be the difficulty of liberation.

So, what is important is to understand the whole process of the self, of the 'me'; for without that understanding, there is no possibility of a new and fundamental action. If one would understand society and bring

about a fundamental revolution in the social structure, one must obviously begin with oneself; because, we are not different from society. What we are, society is. We have made society from ourselves, from our reactions, from our responses; and without understanding our responses, there is no possibility of a radical change in society.

I have several questions, and I shall try to answer them as briefly as possible; but the solution to any problem does not lie in the answer. The answer is never important; what is important is the understanding of the problem. If we approach the problem merely with a desire to find an answer, we shall not be in a position to understand the problem itself. Most of us are eager to find an answer, a solution, eager to solve the problem; and this very eagerness prevents the full observation and clear understanding of the problem. Whatever the problem may be, as long as we seek an answer away from the problem, the problem cannot give its whole significance. Most of us have problems in our life; and to carry a problem on from day to day exhausts the mind. Conflict can never solve any problem. What brings about the solution of a problem is to study it, to observe it, for only then can it reveal its full significance. But that is arduous; and we are always so anxious to go beyond the problem that we are incapable of living with it, of allowing it to unfold, to give its perfume. Surely, the problem comes to an end only when it is understood completely.

Question : I want to help people. What is the best way ?

KRISHNAMURTI : I wonder why you want to help people? Is it because you love people? And if you love, will you ask what is the best way to help? There are different ways of 'helping' people, are there not? The

market helps people; the doctor, the lawyer, the scientist, the labourer, the priest—they are all 'helping' people, are they not? The desire to serve people has become a profession, and this desire always has a reward attached to it. Service organizes itself into efficient groups, and each group is in contention with the other. All desire to serve, to help; and all are in competition with each other, becoming more and more efficient, therefore, more and more ruthless.

So, when you say you want to 'help' people, what do you mean by that word? How can you help people? At what level do you want to help people? Is it at the economic level, or at the so-called spiritual or psychological level? Some are content to help people merely at the economic level, at the immediate social level. Their concern, therefore, is to bring about social reformation. But mere reform creates the need for further reform, and there is no end to reformation. And there are those who want to help people psychologically or spiritually. But to help another in the psychological or spiritual sense, must you not understand yourself first? It is so easy to say, 'I can help another', to have the desire, the wish, the longing, to help; but in the very process of helping, you may bring about confusion.

So, if you would help others at any level, is it not important to see that there must be, not mere patchwork reform, but a fundamental revolution? And can fundamental revolution be based on an idea? Is revolution ever a revolution when it is born of thought? Because, ideas are always limited, they are conditioned responses, are they not? Thought is always the response of memory, therefore it is always conditioned; and any revolution based on an idea can never be a fundamental transformation. The more there are revolutions based on ideas, the more separation and disintegration there will be; because, ideas, beliefs,

and dogmas, always separate people, they can never bring people together, except in mutually exclusive and conflicting groups. They are a most disastrous foundation on which to build a society, because they inevitably create enmity.

Now, seeing all that, if you really want to bring about a fundamental revolution in the structure of society, surely you must begin on the psychological level, that is, with yourself. And if you really bring about in yourself a fundamental transformation, then you will be able to help others not to create illusions, not to create more dogmas, more beliefs, more cages for people to be caught in. Then your desire to help another will not be born of any conviction, of any calculation, of any belief. You will help people because you love them, because your heart is full. But your heart can never be full if it is the mind that fills the heart; and most of us have our hearts filled with the things of the mind. It is only when our hearts are filled with the things of the mind that we want to know how to help; but when the heart is empty of the things of the mind, and is therefore full, then there is a possibility of helping. When one really loves, one helps. But love is not a thing of the mind. Love is not sensation. You cannot think about love. If you think about love, you are only thinking about sensation, which is not love. When you say, 'I love somebody', you are not thinking about love, but about the sensation, the image, the picture, of that person.

So, thought is not love. Love is something that cannot be captured by the mind. The mind can only capture sensation, and then it is sensation that fills our hearts; and from that sensation there comes the desire to help people through making them better, through reforming them, and so on and on. As long as our hearts are filled with the things of the mind, there is no love; and when there is

love, there is no question of how to help people. The very action of love, without the interference of the mind, helps people; but as long as the mind interferes, there can be no love.

Question : My life seems to be aimless, and as a result my behaviour is unintelligent. Should I not have an over-all purpose ?

KRISHNAMURTI : How will you discover an over-all purpose? And why do you want a purpose? Can you discover a purpose that will cover the whole significance of existence? And what is the instrument that discovers? Most of us want a purpose, for then we can use it as a guide, and according to our purpose we can build; in its shadow we can live securely, purposefully, with a sense of direction. Without an end, a goal, a purpose, most of us are lost and our action becomes unintelligent, as the questioner says.

Now, can you find an over-all purpose? How will you set about to find it? Who is the entity that will find it? Surely, it is your own mind, your own desire and longing; so, your own desire will shape the end, will it not? That is, your own desire creates the end or the purpose. To put it differently, you are confused, and your actions are therefore unintelligent. Out of this confusion, you want to choose an end, an over-all purpose. But can you choose anything when you are confused? And will whatever you choose not also be confused? Surely, it is important to clarify the confusion, and not choose a purpose out of that confusion. There is the purgation of confusion only when you begin to understand every act of that confusion; and in that very process you will discover a clarity which is its own end.

Most of us are confused, struggling, uncertain, we do not know what to do. We have created society and are subject to all of its influences, its

demands, its wars, its utter confusion, misery and destruction. We are part of all that; and if, in that state, we make a choice, whatever we choose will obviously still be confused. And that is what is happening in the world, is it not? Being confused, we choose a leader, and therefore the leader is also confused. But if we can patiently understand our own confusion, going deeper and deeper, ever more widely and extensively, into all the layers of consciousness, then we will see that out of that understanding there comes a clarity; and that clarity brings about a spontaneous behaviour which is not chosen by will or guided by any particular pattern.

So, what is essential is, not to have a purpose, but to understand oneself. That is, one must begin to see the deep inward source of conflict, misery, pain, uncertainty; and in the very process of that understanding, there comes a direct action which is not in the shadow of a determined end.

Question : What objective proof is there of the experiencing of reality? In the search for reality, is not self-confidence necessary?

KRISHNAMURTI: Surely, there are two kinds of self-confidence, are there not? There is the self-confidence which comes through having a particular faculty, through experience, through repetition or practice, through gain. That is, the more you acquire at any level, the greater the self-confidence. Such confidence only breeds arrogance, defensive attitudes, and enmity, within and without, because it is essentially based on the expansion of the self. The more you possess, the more you acquire, the more you experience, the greater the strength of the self, of the 'me', and that obviously breeds a certain kind of self-assurance. But surely, such self-confidence is a form of resistance, is it not? It only strengthens the

process of isolation, ultimately leading to illusion, to misery.

Now, I think there is a different kind of confidence, which is not based on accumulation. It is the confidence that comes through experimentation, through being sensitive, alert, through continual discovery and understanding of every response, every idea, every movement of thought. That is quite a different kind of confidence, is it not? Because, in that confidence, there is no question of an accumulating centre. The moment you have an accumulating centre, there can be no rapid adjustment, swift sensitivity, nor the immediate perception that understands fully and extensively every movement of thought and feeling. It is the confidence born of understanding that is essential—not the self-assurance which breeds arrogance; and that confidence comes only when there is constant watchfulness without accumulation. How can you be sensitive when you are accumulating? The person who is accumulating is shrewd and watchful to save himself and his accumulation; but surely, that is not sensitivity. The confidence of sensitivity, which is essential, comes into being only when there is no sense of accumulation, when there is no centre which is always gathering, which is always craving for more.

The other part of this question is, "What objective proof is there of the experiencing of reality?" What do you mean by objective proof? A demonstration? An argument capable of convincing another? A system of philosophy, carefully devised and sharply defined, so that others can see it? Do you want the authority of another to support your own experience? Is truth, reality, something to be proved, either to another or to yourself? As long as we want proof, which means that we want to be made certain in our own experience, whatever we experience is not truth. Most of us want assurance, we want to be assured that we are experiencing

what we call truth. We want to be sure that we are not caught in the net of illusion, of myths, and so on, and that what we experience is real. We want not only objective proof, but also subjective proof.

Now, as long as the mind clings to any form of experience, it is bound to be caught in illusion, because then it is the residue or memory of the experience that becomes all-significant to the mind. What is remembered is the sensation of the experience. If the sensation is painful, it is avoided; if pleasurable, it is retained. So, as long as the mind clings to any so-called spiritual experience, living around the sensation of it and building that into its own existence, it is bound to be caught in the net of illusion.

Reality is not cumulative, it is not to be gathered, it does not give you any assurance, any gratification. It comes when the mind is quiet, tranquil, not demanding; and it is to be understood from moment to moment. And there is no accumulation, no urge for more, as a result of that experience. The moment you want an assurance of the truth of your experience, you may be sure that the experience is an illusion. A mind that craves to be certain, that seeks certainty as an end, is conditioning itself; and therefore, whatever experience it has will only further condition it, bringing about more struggle and misery.

You may have an experience, and because it is pleasurable, you cling to it; the mind goes back to that pleasure over and over again. So, the past becomes extraordinarily significant, and your memories of it then prevent the experiencing of the new. There is a possibility of experiencing the new only when the mind is not anchored to any particular pleasure or experience.

So, there is no proof of reality, objective or subjective; but what is important is the conduct of life, for behaviour is not different from

righteousness. Merely to seek proof of subjective experience in no way transforms the conduct of life. On the contrary, it prevents righteous behaviour, because the past experience then becomes all-important, and the mind is made incapable of understanding its own responses in the present. Do not let us be caught in proof and disproof, in assertions and denials, but let us understand confusion, struggle, misery, ill-will, enmity, greed, and ambition. When the mind is free from all that, from all the worldly things which it creates and clings to, then there is a real possibility of stillness; and in that stillness, in that tranquillity, reality comes into being. But to ask for proof of reality is to ask the impossible; because, if you want assurance, you do not want truth. For truth or reality to be, the state of uncertainty is essential, because only then is there no accumulation, no centre around which the mind can dwell.

What is important, then, is not to seek proof of reality, but to look to one's conduct in every day life, to be choicelessly aware of what we do, what we think, what we say. In the freedom of that understanding, the mind is quiet, not demanding, not projecting; and in that stillness, there is the real.

Question : My thoughts wander to such an extent that I find meditation extremely difficult. Is not concentration necessary for meditation ?

KRISHNAMURTI : This is a very complex question, and to understand it fully I am afraid we will have to go rather deeply into the problem. Meditation of the right kind is essential, but very few people know the full significance of meditation. They may learn a few tricks from some oriental teacher, or from their own priest, but that is not meditation. Meditation is something which has no

result, nor is meditation the search for a result. We will find out what is right meditation only if we can understand the process of thinking. The questioner wants to know how to concentrate, because his thoughts wander.

Now, why do our thoughts wander? Have you ever watched your mind in action? It is always going off, it is always being distracted—at least, that is what we call it. Distracted from what? Distracted from a central thought, a thought which you have chosen and upon which you want to dwell. Please follow this, if you will, and you will see what is right meditation. Without right meditation, self-knowledge is not possible; and without self-knowledge, do what you will, there can be no right thinking. So, meditation is fundamentally necessary. But we must understand what meditation is, so I hope you will follow it patiently.

When we want to focus our attention on a particular thought, the mind wanders off repeatedly, and there is a constant struggle to keep it focussed; and the wandering off we call distraction. Now, there are several things involved in this process. First, you choose a central thought upon which you wish to dwell, and as that choice is made out of confusion, there is resistance against other thoughts. That is, as long as you have a chosen central thought upon which you wish to dwell, every other thought is a distraction; and it is important to discover why you choose that central thought. Surely, you have chosen it from among many thoughts because it gives you pleasure, or it promises you a reward, a comfort. That is why you wish to dwell on it. But the very desire to dwell on it creates resistance against the other thoughts which come pouring in; and so you keep up the battle, the constant fight between the central thought and the other thoughts. And if ultimately you can conquer all other thoughts and make

them one, you think you know how to meditate. Surely, that is really quite immature.

So, it is futile to say, 'This is the right thought, and all the rest are distractions'. What is important is to find out why the mind wanders. Why does it wander? It wanders because it is interested in all the things that are going on. It has some vested interest in every thought that comes back, otherwise it would not come back. Every thought has some significance, some value, some hidden meaning; and so, like weeds, they keep coming.

Now, if you can understand each thought and not resist it, not push it away; if you can look at each thought as it arises and uncover its meaning; then you will see that those thoughts never come back—they are finished. Only thoughts that are not fully understood are repetitive. So, the important thing is not the controlling of thought, but the understanding of thought. Anybody can learn to control thought, but that is not understanding. In merely controlling thought there is no flexibility, it is only a form of resistance. All disciplining of thought to a particular pattern creates resistance; and how can you understand through resistance?

The questioner asks, "Is not concentration necessary for meditation?" What do we mean by concentration? By concentration we mean exclusion, do we not? To concentrate is to exclude every thought but one. Therefore, with most of us, concentration is a narrowing-down process; and a mind that is narrowed down, limited, disciplined, controlled, shaped, according to its own desires and the influences of its environment, can obviously never be free. So, concentration, as most people practise it in what they call meditation, is a form of exclusion, and therefore a process of self-isolation. This isolation is self-protection; and a mind that is protecting

itself must inevitably be in a state of fear. And how can a mind which is fearful ever be open to that which is real?

If you examine and understand the significance of every thought, you will inevitably and naturally come to the question of whether the thinker is separate from thought. If the thinker is separate from thought, then the thinker can operate upon thought, can control and shape thought. But is the thinker separate from thought? Does not the thinker come into being because of his thought? Surely, the two are not separate; the thinker, the experiencer, is not separate from what is experienced.

Now, the moment you see that there is no thinker separate from thought, that there is only thought, then all choice is removed, is it not? That is, if there is only thought and not the translation of thought, then there is no entity that says, 'I will choose this thought and reject the others'; there is no translator, no interpreter, no judge, no bearer of the club. Then you will see that there is no conflict between the thinker and the thought, and therefore the mind is no longer chattering, no longer caught in the word 'distraction'. Then every movement of thought becomes a significant one. And if you go still deeper, you will find that the mind becomes very quiet. It is no longer made quiet, it is no longer disciplined to be quiet.

A mind which is made quiet by discipline, is a dull mind; it lives in its formula of discipline, and such a mind is not sensitive, free. It is

only in the known, it is not an open mind; therefore, it is incapable of receiving the unknown, the imponderable. A mind that is disciplined can never be extensive; it is a limited mind, and whatever it does, is bound to be always petty. God is made petty by a petty mind. So, when the mind sees that whatever it does to control its own thought only makes it more narrow, limited, conditioned, then the thought process as we know it comes to an end, because the thinker is no longer fighting with his thoughts. Then the mind becomes quiet, still, without any contradiction; and in that stillness, there are wider and deeper states. But if you merely pursue the deeper, it becomes imagination, speculation. Imagination and speculation must cease for reality to be.

So, this whole process of understanding oneself is the beginning of meditation. There is no technique, no special posture, no acquired method of breathing, nor any of the tricks that one learns from books or from others. Self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation. Without knowing yourself, whatever you think has no reality, no basis. But to know yourself, there must be constant watchfulness—not with a stick, not with condemnation or justification, but just awareness, a passive alertness, in which you see things as they are. In seeing things as they are, you understand yourself, which leads to perfect tranquillity of mind: and only in that tranquillity, that stillness of the heart and mind, can reality be.